

LADSTONE OR SALISBURY?

“THAT IS THE QUESTION.”

EDITED BY

ANDREW REID.

EDITOR OF “WHY I AM A LIBERAL,” “IRELAND,”
AND “WHY I WOULD DISESTABLISH.”

“We have the people’s heart.”

London:

REMINGTON & CO., PUBLISHERS,

HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1886.

CONTRIBUTORS.

JUSTIN HUNTLY McCARTHY, M.P.

VISCOUNT HAMPDEN.

SAMUEL MORLEY.

JOSEPH ARCH, M.P.

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY, Bart., M.P.

THOMAS BURT, M.P.

E. N. BUXTON, M.P.

DR. B. W. FOSTER, M.P.

GILBERT BEITH, M.P.

OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.

HON. W. H. JAMES, M.P.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

REV. SAMUEL COX, D.D.

VISCOUNT KILCOURSIE, M.P.

REV. BROOKE LAMBERT.

REV. J. GUINNESS ROGERS.

MRS. BATESON.

SAMUEL STOREY, M.P.

LADY FLORENCE DIXIE.

PROFESSOR SIGERSON, M.D., F.R.U.I.

W. LEIGH BERNARD.

DR. WEINMANN AND HENRY BLAU.

MY COUNTRYMEN!

GLADSTONE OR SALISBURY? That is the question. Whether you will rally round and carry tri-umphantly GLADSTONE—the personal embodiment and representative of the great struggling idea and principle of Liberty: in whose march and victory the people have become happier and happier year by year; or whether you will support SALISBURY and the Tory candidate, the representative and embodiment of the opposing idea of Tyranny, Class, Aristocracy, as against the Multitude—of Force, which is no remedy, as against the cheerful, joyous Consent to the law, which is a great remedy, because the people respect and obey, with their whole heart, the law made with their own hands.

To whom ought Ireland to belong? To the Irish people, you reply. To whom ought the Irish soil and the Irish laws to belong? To the Irish people, you reply. Who loves Ireland most—we or Irishmen? The Irish, you reply. Can the stranger rule the child better than its own mother? Can the stranger rule Ireland better than Ireland can rule her own sons and daughters? No, you reply. The stranger's mind may be larger, but his heart is smaller. *He is a stranger*, and hath not that infinite touchableness, sympathy, and affection of the mother and patriot which give to untutored and ignorant men and women wisdom—yea! eyes

of fire, searching into the darkness and making little things visible which to the stranger and stepmother are hidden nothings.

Fine sentiments! But the foundations on which God has built the family and the nation, and the foundations on which His servant, Gladstone, has built his Irish policy. What sort of Conservatives are ye, O Tories, who would bombard the foundations laid by the Almighty!

The Inspired Statesman is he who would twist into strong withes the great natural and human feelings, and bind with these bands the peoples together. Such an inspired statesman is Mr. Gladstone.

The Resolute Governor is the Unnatural Monster who would unite Ireland to the Empire not by sentiment, but by manacles. His chief minister would be the Black-Smith (not the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, M.P., whom we all sincerely respect).

Be ye the RESOLUTE PEOPLE who will defeat this Would-Be Resolute Governor for Twenty Years—Lord Salisbury!

Beware!—If Salisbury rules over Ireland, Salisbury rules over You! Stoop not to pick up PINS—the Voice of Liberty calls you!

Hasten away to the Poll!

Ireland for the Irish, and the Greatest Britain for us all! GLADSTONE AND LIBERTY!

ANDREW REID.

IRELAND TO GLADSTONE, 1886.

BY JUSTIN HUNTLY McCARTHY, M.P.

STATESMAN, and friend, and father, and what-
soe'er

Title of dearer love our Irish lips
Can utter, be the blessing of our race,
The sad race of the sunless centuries,
On you and on your children and your name
For ever, for we love you, father and friend.

How shall our full hearts praise you, with what
wealth

Of passion moulded into golden speech
Shall Ireland answer England when the voice
Of England's wisest, touched with the sacred
fire

Of genius and of justice, proffers peace
In place of battle, love for hatred, light
In lieu of darkness, home in exile's stead,
And for the dead dread past a future fair
With hope of what all men most cherish, hope
Of free life under guidance of free laws?

Let the new right atone the ancient wrong,
And Ireland holding out a brother's hand
To England's white Democracy declare
The old strife buried, the red wound healed,
the wrath—
The righteous wrath of men made slaves by
men—
Quenched in this hour of fair fraternity :
Ireland is England's brother.

Memory

Sits at the mouth of darkness and discerns
The glorious phantoms throng, shade after
shade
Of those who dreamed and struggled, dreamed
and died
For Ireland through the ages, the dear dead
Whose graves are in the hearts of Irishmen.
Statesman, the dead salute you ; friend, the
dead
Reach out their ghostly hands in benison
Upon your purpose ; father, the dead forgive
Seven centuries of anguish for your sake.

Your enemies are many, heed them not :
What though false friends from their allegiance
fall,
What though cabal in darkness skulks and
stings,
What though the legions of misrule array

Falsehood and fear and faction, heed them not :
Think on your friends, take count of your
allies,

See who are ranged in battle by your side,
Justice, and truth, and freedom and the love
Men bear the land that bore them, fortitude
To suffer greatly in great enterprise,
Honour and courage and eternal love
And that proud patience which the Fates revere,
These are your friends, your champions. Be
assured

They shall not fail, they never yet have failed,
The true man fighting for the truth. Bear on
The banner of freedom, and God speed the
right.

Statesman, friend, father, your reward shall be
A living nation's love, the gratitude
Of a great empire healed of deadly hurt,
Supreme in having courage to be just
And free dispensing freedom ; and besides
A memory shining star-like through the depth
Of distant cycles, an abiding place
Within the shrine of every Irish heart
While generation after generation fill
The populous years with life.

You come to us
With message of perfect peace ; shall peace
not be
Between us till Time's shuttle shall spin off
The web of the world's story ? Ireland, England,

But yesterday the fiercest foes on earth,
 May be fast friends to-morrow! Join our
 hands,
 That from this hour the fairest fellowship
 Of freemen linked with freemen in true love
 Begin between these islands.

Unto God

The glory of such an hour, and unto you,
 God's instrument in knitting hearts and hands
 Of Celt and Saxon in such brothers' bonds,
 Honour and love and immortality.

JUSTIN HUNTLY MCCARTHY.

ISAIAH.

THE LIBERAL.

The instruments also of the CHURL are evil: he deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, even WHEN THE NEEDY SPEAKETH RIGHT.

BUT THE LIBERAL DEVISETH LIBERAL THINGS;
 AND BY LIBERAL THINGS SHALL HE STAND.—
Isaiah xxxii. 7, 8.

ARISTOTLE.

SUPERIOR WISDOM AND VIRTUE OF THE
PEOPLE OVER CLASS.

The opinion that THE MULTITUDE should be supreme (κύριον) rather than THE CHOICE FEW (τοὺς ἀρίστους μὲν ὀλίγους), is not free from a certain degree of difficulty ; but it admits of explanation and contains an element of truth. For THE MANY, though none of them excels individually, when they combine are likely to be better than THE FEW BEST viewed in the lump. For each individual among THE MANY has a share of virtue and practical wisdom, and when they meet together THE MULTITUDE are like ONE MAN, who has MANY FEET and HANDS and SENSES : THAT IS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE ETHICAL AND INTELLECTUAL SUPERIORITY OF THE MULTITUDE VIEWED COLLECTIVELY OVER THE CHOICE FEW.—*Politics*, Book iii. c. II.

MACHIAVELLI.

RESOLUTE POLICY.

For, however irresistible a Ruler may be in the Field, he must always rely on the GOODWILL OF HIS SUBJECTS FOR THE SECURITY OF HIS THRONE.—*Il Principe*, c. iii.

W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

HOME RULE FOR CANADA.

1853.

“Be just and fear not. WE SHALL NOT REFRAIN FROM DOING A THING THAT IS IN ITSELF JUST AND RIGHT, BECAUSE WE FEAR THAT EVIL MAY COME OF IT. The Canadians are entitled in justice to the management of their own affairs, and no apprehension of the use they may make of those privileges will warrant you in depriving them—I will almost venture to say defrauding them—of the exercise of their rights.”—*Speech, House of Commons, March, 1853.*

LOYALISTS.

In same speech Mr. Gladstone observed (mark, in 1853):

“I lamented nothing more in the speech of the right hon. gentleman the member for Droitwich than the part in which I heard him say that he appealed to one portion of the population of Canada. It is high time to have done appealing to one part of the people. WE KNOW OF OLD THE MEANING OF THESE WORDS; WE KNOW FROM DISASTROUS

EXPERIENCE THEIR EFFECTS ; WE KNOW THAT THE EFFECT OF THEM WAS TO CREATE KNOTS AND CLIQUES OF INTRIGUERS, WHO PUT UPON THEMSELVES THE PROFESSION OF BRITISH SUPPORTERS, WHO DENIED THE NAME OF LOYALISTS to all who would not adopt their shibboleth, and caused a strong reaction in the minds of the colonial population. So that if under that system of government you hope to govern the people of Canada, you must expect the spread, if not of disloyalty, yet of disaffection and dissent ; and that pervading the great mass of the community there will be a current of public opinion throughout the Colony, if not contrary to, yet distinct from, the current of British feeling."

B. DISRAELI, M.P., 1844.

"THE Irish," he said, "in extreme distress inhabited an island where there was an Established Church which was not their Church, and a territorial aristocracy, the richest of whom lived in foreign capitals. Thus they had a starving population, an absentee aristocracy, and an alien Church ; and, in addition, the weakest Executive in the world. That was the Irish Question. WELL, THEN, WHAT WOULD HON. GENTLEMEN SAY IF THEY WERE READING OF A COUNTRY IN THAT POSITION ? THEY WOULD SAY AT ONCE, 'THE REMEDY IS RE-

OLUTION.' BUT THE IRISH COULD NOT HAVE A REVOLUTION ; AND WHY ? BECAUSE IRELAND WAS CONNECTED WITH ANOTHER AND MORE POWERFUL COUNTRY. THEN WHAT WAS THE CONSEQUENCE ? THE CONNECTION WITH ENGLAND THUS BECAME THE CAUSE OF THE PRESENT STATE OF IRELAND. If the connection with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution was the only remedy, ENGLAND LOGICALLY WAS IN THE ODIOS POSITION OF BEING THE CAUSE OF ALL THE MISERY IN IRELAND. What, then, was the duty of an English Minister ? TO EFFECT BY HIS POLICY ALL THOSE CHANGES WHICH A REVOLUTION WOULD DO BY FORCE. THAT WAS THE IRISH QUESTION IN ITS INTEGRITY. . . . But I will say, if these recommendations are adopted, that in fifty years hence the men who shall succeed the present generation in Parliament will find the people of Ireland a contented and thriving peasantry. I do not believe that this object will be carried by the personage whom the hon. member for Belfast calls Louis Philippe, meaning, I suppose, the King of the French. I look to no foreign, no illegitimate influences for bringing about that result—not to the passions of the Irish people, not to the machinations of their demagogues, not to the intrigues of distant nations, but to a power far more influential, far more benignant—a power more recently risen in the world, not yet sufficiently recognised—[*Mr. Ward :*

“What, Young England?”] No, not Young England, but a power which Young England respects—that irresistible law of our modern civilisation which has decreed that the system which cannot bear discussion is doomed.”—*Speech, House of Commons.*

1868.

With reference, however, to that passage which has been quoted from a speech, Mr. Disraeli had thus spoken:—“I have been reminded in the course of this debate of expressions which I used five-and-twenty years ago. I could remind other gentlemen of expressions they used on the same subject five-and-twenty years ago; but I do not much care for that sort of thing. With reference, however, to that passage, which has been quoted from a speech made by me, I may remark that it appeared to me at the time I made it that nobody listened to it. It seemed to me that I was pouring water upon sand, but it seems now that the water came from a golden goblet. With regard to the passage from that speech, there are many remarks which, if I wanted to vindicate or defend myself, I might legitimately make. . . . But I do not care to say it, and I do not wish to say it, because in my conscience the sentiment of that speech was right. It may have been expressed with the heedless rhetoric which I

suppose is the appanage of all who sit below the gangway ; but in my historical conscience the sentiment of that speech was right.”—*Speech, House of Commons, March 16th.*

1869.

This speech was alluded to, and quoted several times in the debate of last year (1868) by Mr. Bright, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Gladstone, and others. “There is no injustice at all,” said Mr. Gladstone (April 3rd, 1868), “in referring to the speech of the Prime Minister in 1844, for the plain and simple reason that the right hon. gentleman has distinctly stated, twice over, in the midst of many apologetic expressions, that the sentiment of that speech was right. Now, what was the sentiment of that speech ? I have read it lately, and have not forgotten it. Many hon. members may have read it, but those who have not have a treat to enjoy. I speak seriously. The right hon. gentleman disparaged the speech ; but a more closely-woven tissue of argument and observation has seldom been known in the debates of this House. The whole of that speech, referable to the Church of Ireland, may be fairly summed up in the single word ‘Destruction.’”—*Mr. Disraeli’s Note to his Speeches, “Constitutional Policy,” published 1870.*

JOHN BRIGHT, M.P.

"I have never said that Irishmen are not at liberty to ask for, and if they could accomplish it, to obtain the repeal of the Union. I SAY THAT WE HAVE NO RIGHT WHATEVER TO INSIST UPON A UNION BETWEEN IRELAND AND GREAT BRITAIN UPON OUR TERMS ONLY."—*Speech at Liverpool*, June 3, 1868.

"I am sorry to see that some of our friends in England are insisting that IF YOU DO A CERTAIN THING IN IRELAND YOU MUST THEREFORE DO IT IN ENGLAND; that an English Act will follow inevitably from an Irish Act."—*Speech at Edinburgh*, November 3, 1868.

"There are those among us who disbelieve in any permanent reconciliation with Great Britain, who think that the only true and lasting remedy for Irish discontent is to be found either in the repeal of the Act of Union or in absolute independence. . . . I am one of those who admit—as every sensible man must admit—that an act which the Parliament of the United Kingdom has passed the Parliament of the United Kingdom can repeal. And, further, I am willing to admit that everybody in England allows with regard to every foreign country, that any nation, believing it to be its interest, HAS A RIGHT BOTH TO ASK FOR AND TO STRIVE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE. My purpose in legislating with regard to the land will be gradually, but I hope also rapidly, to restore to the population of Ireland,

to the skilled farmers, or to those among them who save money—to restore to them a proprietary right in the soil of the country. THERE ALWAYS COMES TO MY AID A FEELING WHICH I HAVE HAD EVER SINCE I ENTERED THE POLITICAL FIELD—A DEEP AND ABIDING FAITH IN JUSTICE. I BELIEVE THAT JUSTICE MAY BE CALLED, OF ALL THINGS, THE MIRACLE-WORKER AMONGST MEN. I BELIEVE THAT ALL MEN ARE TO BE REACHED BY IT, AND ALL BODIES OF MEN—THE INHABITANTS OF PROVINCES AS OF NATIONS; AND THERE IS NOTHING I BELIEVE MORE FIRMLY THAN THIS—THAT IF THERE BE A PEOPLE ON THE FACE OF THE EARTH WHOSE HEARTS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO JUSTICE, IT IS THE IRISH PEOPLE. There can be no great measure accomplished unless all concerned lend willing hands; and there can be no great act of national and historic reconciliation unless all the parties hitherto opposed are willing to be reconciled. Let us make a new treaty—not written on parchment, not bound with an oath. Its conditions should be these :—JUSTICE ON THE PART OF GREAT BRITAIN; FORGIVENESS ON THE PART OF IRELAND. IT SHALL BE WRITTEN IN THE HEARTS OF THREE NATIONS; AND WE WILL PRAY TO HIM WHO IS THE COMMON FATHER OF ALL PEOPLES, AND IN WHOSE HAND ARE THE DESTINIES OF ALL STATES, THAT HE WILL MAKE IT LAST FOR EVER AND FOR EVER INVIOLETE.”—*Speech at Limerick, July 14, 1868.*

W. E. FORSTER, 1883.

“THE contrast between the Province of Bulgaria, as I saw it in 1876, and the Principality of Bulgaria, as I saw it this month (October, 1883), was most striking. IN LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS A RACE OF SLAVES HAS BECOME A NATION OF FREE MEN. I saw hundreds (I may almost say thousands) of Bulgarians as I went about the country, and was as much delighted as surprised at the sturdy independence and intelligent aspect of the peasant people. The POLICY OF GIVING THEM SELF-GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN SIGNALLY SUCCESSFUL. The Bulgarians are well able to govern themselves. That is the chief fact that is impressed upon my mind as the result of my visit. . . . Wherever you turn you meet evidence of improvement. To begin with, the Bulgarians have suppressed that brigandage which is the curse of all the regions still under the Turks. There is no place in either of the Bulgarias where law and order do not prevail or where the authority of the police is disputed. When you consider that the whole of that territory was the cockpit of the East; that Pomak and Circassian and Bashi-Bazouk overran it only six years ago, and that it is not five years since the Russian armies quitted the Province from which they had driven the Turk, this is a

very notable fact. . . . It is a mistake to suppose that to give the Bulgarian liberty is only to change the oppressed into the oppressor. The Turks in the autonomous Provinces are not oppressed. They send members to Parliament. There are five in the Assembly at Philippopolis, and fifteen in the Sobranje at Sophia. I could find no proof that the Government subjects them to any ill-treatment."

LORD SALISBURY

AT NEWPORT, 1885, WHEN PRIME MINISTER.

"You had passed an Act of Parliament, giving in unexampled abundance, and with unexampled freedom, supreme power to the great mass of the Irish people—supreme power as regards their own locality. . . . To my mind the renewal of exceptional legislation against a population whom you had treated legislatively to this MARKED CONFIDENCE WAS SO GROSS IN ITS INCONSISTENCY that you could not possibly hope during the few remaining months that were at your disposal before the present Parliament expired to renew any legislation which expressed on one side a distrust of what on the other side your former legislation had so strongly emphasised. The only result of your doing it would have been, not that you would have passed the Act, but

that you would have promoted, by the VERY INCONSISTENCY OF THE POSITION you were occupying—by the UNTENABLE CHARACTER OF THE ARGUMENTS that you were advancing—you would have produced SO INTENSE AN EXASPERATION amongst the Irish people that you would have caused ten times more evil, ten times more resistance to law than your Crimes Act, even if it had been renewed, would possibly have been able to check.”

LORD R. CHURCHILL, M.P.

January 3rd, 1885.

“It comes to this, that the policy of the Government in Ireland is to declare on the one hand by the passing of the Reform Bill, that the Irish people are perfectly capable of exercising the highest rights and privileges of citizenship, and by the proposal to renew the Crimes Act they simultaneously declare, on the other hand, that the Irish people are perfectly incapable of performing for the advantage of society the lowest and most ordinary duties of citizenship. . . . All I can say is, that, if such an incoherent, such a ridiculous, such a dangerously ridiculous, combination of acts can be called a policy, then, thank God, the Conservative party have no policy.”

C. S. PARNELL, M.P.

IN accepting this Bill, they went under honourable obligations not to abuse their powers—and they pledged themselves and the Irish people, as far as they could pledge themselves, not to abuse those powers. But if abuse should take place, the Imperial Parliament was there in its full plenitude of power, ready to intervene, but only ready to intervene in grave and urgent necessity—and this was by far the best way in which they could leave the question. Parliament, they knew, had the real power—force—which became the real power when abuses were committed and injustice was done. Parliament would have the imperial power unimpaired, just as much as if this Bill had never been brought forward. He could only repeat that he accepted, and he believed the Irish people would accept, this Bill as a final settlement of the national question. The measure had been accepted in the sense which he indicated by all the leaders of every section of national opinion in Ireland and outside of Ireland. Not a single voice had been raised against the Bill by any Irishman of Nationalist opinions, and of course there were sections amongst Irish Nationalists just as there were

in the great Conservative party. So far as it was possible for a nation to accept a measure, cheerfully, freely, and gladly, without reserve, the Irish people had shown that they accepted this Bill. Even the terrible *Irish World*, which had not been on his side for the last five or six years, said, "The Irish race at home and abroad have signified their willingness to accept the terms of peace."

THE LATE SPEAKER—VISCOUNT HAMPDEN.

It is true that I am a warm supporter of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy of extending self-government to Ireland upon a broad basis in accordance with the desire of an overwhelming majority of the Irish people—that is, by the establishment of a single Legislative Assembly for the control of affairs strictly Irish, and had I been called upon to vote in the late division on the Government of Ireland Bill I should without hesitation have voted for the second reading.

But the Bill requires amendment in several particulars; and no man, I apprehend, is more alive to this necessity than Mr. Gladstone himself, who has repeatedly appealed, but in vain, to the constructive statesmanship of the

House of Commons to assist him in amending the Bill in Committee.

I cannot within the compass of a letter give in full the reasons which have led me to the conclusion that the time has come to make peace with Ireland upon terms which, while giving her the union she desires, will strengthen the Empire.

But among those reasons the following have had much weight with me :—

1. The Union, as now established, has been only maintained through Coercion Acts repeatedly passed by Parliament against the will of the Irish people, and without coercion such a union cannot hereafter be maintained.

2. The action of Mr. O'Connell and his followers, of Mr. Smith O'Brien, of Mr. Butt, and lastly of Mr. Parnell, are proofs, if any were wanting, of Irish disaffection as represented in our House of Commons.

3. Under the operation of Household Suffrage, and a redistribution of political power recently conceded, that disaffection is manifested in larger measure in the present Parliament. In former Parliaments the contingent of Irish disaffection numbered about forty members. It now numbers eighty-six members, and would probably increase should coercive laws be again applied.

4. It has been difficult, as I can testify, to carry on the business of the House of Commons in the face of forty disaffected members ; it

will be still more difficult to do so in the face of the larger contingent of eighty-six disaffected members. It can be done, no doubt ; but the House of Commons is, humanly speaking, omnipotent. But this end can only be attained by the exercise of coercive laws not only outside the House against the people of Ireland, but also inside the House against their members.

5. If the Irish asked for concessions either unreasonable or dangerous, of course they should be resisted. But there is nothing unreasonable in their demand for self-government, while any apprehended dangers may be guarded against.

My voice, therefore, is for making peace with them, taking such securities as may be necessary for the integrity of the Empire.

The Government of Ireland Bill, although lost, is a message of peace to Ireland, and may lead to a more hearty union than that against which the Irish have constantly protested throughout the present century.

HAMPDEN.

SAMUEL MORLEY.

THE Liberalism of my early days stood for orderly progress tending in the direction of freedom and liberty for the people, and after fifty years of public life I can appeal to the record of legislation coming within that period as showing that wherever Liberal principles have triumphed, the freedom they have begotten has invariably increased the happiness and prosperity of the masses affected by such legislation. "TRUST IN THE PEOPLE QUALIFIED BY PRUDENCE" IS MR. GLADSTONE'S DEFINITION OF LIBERALISM, AND I BELIEVE THAT NOT ONLY DOES THIS APPLY TO THE ENGLISH PEOPLE, BUT ALSO TO THE IRISH NATION.

There seem to me to be but two possible ways of governing the people of Ireland—the one by coercion, the other by giving to them institutions suited to their legitimate aspirations. The former method we have tried until all parties are sick of it; the latter we are now seeking to find and bestow.

I am not prepared to say that some modifications have not yet to be found for Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme, but I, for one, am at any rate ready to stand by the leader whose unrivalled experience, political genius, and undoubted patriotism alike, in my opinion,

deserve the allegiance of all who wish to see the union of England and Ireland preserved on a secure basis, as well as the removal of a menace to the peace and a hindrance to the well-being of both countries.

SAMUEL MORLEY.

JOSEPH ARCH, M.P.

I FOLLOW Mr. Gladstone: First—Because the policy of the Tory party is to suppress the National League; TO KEEP IRELAND IN BONDAGE FOR TWENTY YEARS; to Expatriate a million of her people; WHICH MEANS misery, poverty, INCONCEIVABLE SUFFERING AND PREMATURE DEATH TO THOUSANDS OF INNOCENT MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN in that already oppressed country. Second—I follow Mr. Gladstone—BECAUSE I FULLY BELIEVE HIS WHOLE HEART IS SET TO GIVE THAT MEASURE OF JUSTICE TO IRELAND, WHICH, instead of perpetuating her poverty and misery, WILL INCREASE HER AFFECTION and RESPECT FOR THIS COUNTRY, and in the long run will effect a peaceful Settlement between us and our Sister Isle.

JOSEPH ARCH.

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY, Bart., M.P.

ON THE BROAD ISSUE OF DISTRUST OR OF TRUST IN THE IRISH PEOPLE, which forms the real line of cleavage between the supporters and the opponents of his policy, I am, and for years have been, heartily with Mr. Gladstone. I agree with those who think that the faults of the Irish can be traced to SPECIAL CAUSES, and who hope that their faults will disappear when the long-standing causes of bitterness have been removed. The history of the future can alone determine whether our confidence is misplaced.

To those who object to any measure of self-government I would put in all earnestness this question: Can it be said that union in the true sense exists between England and Ireland now? It was well said by Mr. Burke, "No RELUCTANT TIE CAN BE A STRONG ONE."

THOMAS BRASSEY

THOMAS BURT, M.P.

WHY do I support Mr. Gladstone's Irish Policy? Because I think it right in itself that the PASSIONATE LONGING OF THE IRISH PEOPLE FOR DISTINCT NATIONALITY AND SELF-GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE SATISFIED; and because I believe Mr. Gladstone is the one statesman able and willing to give practical effect to the legitimate aspirations of the Irish race. I have no preliminary difficulties of principle to surmount. I declared myself a Home Ruler when I became a candidate for Parliament in 1874. True I saw great practical obstacles in the way of preparing a working scheme of Home Rule. I do not pretend that these obstacles have wholly disappeared; but the situation has been considerably modified. Now that the greatest constructive statesman of the age has put forth his whole strength in trying to solve the problem, I can have no hesitation in supporting him to the utmost extent of my power in his effort to achieve an object with which I am in hearty sympathy.

The Irish Government Bill has been called "a one-man measure." It has been a favourite weapon of warfare by the opponents of the Bill to taunt Liberal members of Parliament who support Home Rule, and the masses of

the people outside, with being blind followers of Mr. Gladstone. Even Mr. Bright has given currency to that notion by declaring that the Bill would not have been approved by twenty members of the House of Commons if it had not been proposed by the Liberal Prime Minister. It may be frankly acknowledged that Mr. Gladstone's influence reckons for much, and Mr. Bright himself would be the first to allow that it should do so. But acceptance of the principle of Home Rule by the British people is much more general than is supposed. My own experience leads me to believe that the great majority of the people of this country consider the claim of Ireland for self-government is a fair claim, and one that should be recognised and carried into practical effect with the least possible friction and delay.

I support Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy because it is thoroughly Radical and democratic. It is founded on trust in the Irish people; on the belief that the best guarantee for securing order and good government is to be found in free representative institutions, administered by men chosen by and responsible to the Irish nation. At present political power in Ireland is divorced from responsibility. The Nationalist members are dominant, and their influence cannot be destroyed or weakened without disfranchising the Irish people. Such disfranchisement the British democracy would

not tolerate. MR. GLADSTONE PROPOSES TO THROW RESPONSIBILITY UPON THOSE WHO ALREADY WIELD THE POWER—A PLAN THAT HAS SUCCEEDED ADMIRABLY ELSEWHERE, AND THAT SEEMS TO ME THE ONLY ONE AVAILABLE IN IRELAND AT THE PRESENT TIME.

I follow Mr. Gladstone because on this Irish, as on all great questions, he takes high moral ground, asking, not whether it is easy or difficult of solution, popular or unpopular, whether it will weaken or strengthen the Liberal party, but whether it is right or wrong, and whether in the long run it will be a benefit or an injury to his country and to humanity. Goldsmith said of Burke that "he gave up to party what was meant for mankind." I don't think that is true of Burke. Certainly Mr. Gladstone has always cared more for the nation than for classes, or professions, or for party. The disestablishment of an alien church in Ireland, the abolition of purchase in the army, the reform of the land laws, are but specimens of the way in which he has dealt with monopolies and privileges whenever they were opposed to the national well-being.

This question will have to be settled by the British nation. Fortunately there is now a wide suffrage; the democracy have full possession of their heritage. No statesman can appeal with such effect to that democracy as Mr. Gladstone. His superb intellectual and

moral qualities ; his oratorical and debating power ; his unrivalled experience ; his constructive statesmanship ; his broad, deep, active sympathies ; his eminent services to his country and to humanity—all these combine to give him an influence never before wielded by a British statesman.

With a cause and a leader which appeal to the popular heart and imagination, I cannot doubt that the verdict of the democracy will be in favour of self-government for Ireland on the lines laid down by Mr. Gladstone.

THOMAS BURT.

E. N. BUXTON, M.P.

THE Bill has been thrown out because it is so much easier to criticise than to construct. All the clever Radicals who have fallen upon it and torn it to pieces have found in so doing a delightful intellectual exercise, but with few exceptions they have not troubled themselves to indicate what they will do when they have to find the other way over the mountain.

Mr. Chamberlain, almost alone among them, has attempted to propound a policy, or rather several policies, for each one in succession has

been as short-lived as the daily newspapers in which they appeared. In his latest he is "determined in his opposition to the establishment of a separate Parliament for Ireland." His lieutenant, Mr. Cann, on the other hand, accepts a legislative body for Ireland, as well as for the other members of the kingdom.

But it is not upon these men, with their divergent policies, that the burden of their victory will fall. It is Lord Salisbury and his underground "colleague" who, if they win at the polls, will have to find a way or make one.

What I want to know is whether Mr. Chamberlain will help his new ally. Will he "enable the Government of England to govern Ireland," that Government being Lord Salisbury's; and is he prepared to wait for the end of that statesman's period of twenty years, until Ireland is thrashed into "accepting any gift in the way of Local Government, or repeal of coercion laws, that you may wish to give"? If not, how soon will he begin to agitate for the "suspension of evictions"?

Destructive criticism is no solution, and for my part I am not prepared to wait until Hatfield and Birmingham agree. It is "the disease and not the remedy" which threatens the empire and which should be attacked. In my heart I believe that the greatest danger to our national life lies in continuing to hold by main force a hostile Ireland. I voted for the

Bill, not accepting the whole of its provisions, but because the best, if not the only, hope which I entertain of reconciling the Irish to our Imperial rule is to be found in giving them the responsibility, as well as the power, of managing their own affairs through a domestic Parliament.

The division of Monday night was only the beginning of the contest. I am loath to think it will be a long one, for whether it lasts for one year or fifty all other questions must stand aside. It is because I want the inevitable battle to be short, sharp, and decisive, because I want the field cleared, that I rejoice in the acceptance by the mass of Liberals and Radicals of the principle of Irish autonomy, not as a plank merely, but, until it is carried, as the whole platform of my party.

E. N. BUXTON.

DR. B. W. FOSTER, M.P., Chairman of Committee,
National Liberal Federation.

I SUPPORT Mr. Gladstone's proposal of Home Rule for Ireland because I believe it will give prosperity to Ireland, develop content instead of discontent among the Irish people, and create a real, instead of a sham, union between the two kingdoms.

Distrust and suspicion of the Irish race are at the bottom of English objections to Home Rule. This distrust and suspicion have arisen from the fact that for generations the only advisers to whom we have listened in public, or conversed with in private, have been for the most part members of the Anglo-Irish colony. They have, through official and private channels, formed the opinion of the upper and middle classes in England.

The Parliament of to-day, however, for the first time, represents the democracy of the United Kingdom, and as it has been called into existence on the principle of trusting the people, and helping them to self-government, it is only logical and just for the representatives of Ireland to demand an extension of these principles to their own country. They ask to be allowed to manage Irish business by Irish methods, and in accordance with Irish ideas. Englishmen are too apt to think, that English methods which suit themselves, ought to suit Irishmen equally well. It is not so. THE

WHOLE TEMPERAMENT AND CHARACTER OF THE TWO PEOPLES ARE DIFFERENT. For eighty-six years we have tried the English method, and the proof of its absolute failure resides in the fact, that the ordinary law which suffices to maintain law and order in England has utterly broken down in Ireland. For the last fifty years, only two years have been free from exceptional and coercive legislation. The Union has indeed failed. It is a paper Union: not the Union of two nations willing to live under common laws, working together with a common purpose for common ends. We are face to face with the necessity for a new departure. Ireland cannot be ruled by the ordinary law. All true Liberals are resolute against coercion. FORCE IS FOR THEM NO REMEDY; TRUST IS THE SOLE AND SURE REMEDY. Mr. Gladstone's Bill is based on the central principle of Trust. The Irish people have accepted it by the voices of their representatives. They have declared their willingness to work the constitution it gives them loyally, with no view to separation. I believe them. Ireland, by its geographical relations to England, could not exist as an independent nation. AS SURELY AS TWO DROPS OF WATER, WHEN NEAR ENOUGH TO ATTRACT EACH OTHER, BECOME ONE, SO SURELY DO TWO ISLANDS PLACED NEAR EACH OTHER BECOME, BY WHAT SEEMS ALMOST A LAW OF NATURE, ONE STATE. Modern civilization has

so annihilated space that year by year Ireland is made closer to England by the facilities of transit. Year by year mutual advantage would bind the islands more firmly together, if we could once destroy the sources of discontent. The timely concession of self-government would, I am convinced, do this effectually. There is a fear expressed by some that an Irish Parliament would misuse its power to oppress the Protestant minority. Mr. Gladstone's scheme provides safeguards, but experience shows that safeguards are needless. The Roman Catholics of Ireland have shown, in spite of their sufferings, little or no retaliatory rancour. The fears of the Ulster Loyalists are, indeed, their strongest condemnation. Men do not fear their neighbours if they have acted justly by them. The rich Anglo-Irish colony has preserved its ascendancy for generations by English aid, and lorded it over the poor Catholic majority. Reprisals are naturally feared. The fear may be great, the danger is small. Once Home Rule is granted men of all shades of political and religious opinions in Ireland would join in the work of government with patriotic earnestness. The Irish have a happy knack of adapting themselves to circumstances. The tall talk of Ulster would soon give way to a business-like desire to make the best of the situation. Irish landlords would find a sphere of congenial activity in the Irish Parliament,

and would cease to be absentees. The Irish farmer would till his land free from the hardships of rack-renting and eviction. The Irish peasant would become, under laws suited to his nature, a peaceful, prosperous, and law-abiding citizen. He is now, as regards ordinary crime, an example to many who despise and disparage him. A race of men who can flourish elsewhere, and who help to build up our colonies into great nations, ought to be able to prosper in their own land, if the conditions were favourable. *Cælum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt.* They change their laws but not their natures when they cross the seas. Give them at home laws and methods of administration suited to the genius of the race, and they will become the most loyal as well as the most patriotic subjects of the Crown. When one reads the dismal diary of Irish history, the wonder grows that the people who have suffered so much are as good as they are. Their dose of original sin, I think, must have been small, for ordinary people under the same conditions of misery and misgovernment, continued through long centuries, would have lapsed into hopeless barbarism.

THE RACE IS WORTH SAVING THAT HAS
RESISTED SO SUCCESSFULLY PAST MISRULE.
LET US TRY A NEW METHOD INSPIRED BY
THE CHARITY THAT HOPETH ALL THINGS.

B. W. FOSTER.

GILBERT BEITH, M.P.

I SUPPORT Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy because his great measure for the future government of Ireland is framed on the fundamental Liberal principle, that "government by the people for the people will be government instinct with humanity and justice, and that its outcome must be in the direction of social order, and moral and material progress."

GILBERT BEITH.

OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.

THE issue before the country is a simple one. How is Ireland to be governed? There are only two methods, Coercion and Home Rule. Some say it is not coercion that we want, we ask for a steady enforcement of the law without fear or favour. Why should not Irishmen be compelled to obey the law as much as Englishmen or Scotchmen? But what is the law, and how is it to be ultimately enforced? A law is not merely the will of Parliament or the utterance of a statute-book, it must be interpreted by judges and be sanctioned by public opinion. The only method known to a free people of getting a good law passed or a bad law repealed is by agitation, and agitation carried to its furthest limits becomes rebellion. Scotch crofters, how-

ever much we sympathise with them, defy the law when they refuse to pay their rents, yet if they did not defy the law, no one would know they had a grievance. Scotch landlords supported by the law exercise a tyranny of devastation, and turn what might be a fertile valley into a desert. If we wish to get these laws altered, we must sometimes resist them in order to show how unjust they are. Law permits an Irish landlord to turn whole families from their hovels into a ditch because they will not pay a rent which they cannot afford to pay. When law sanctions injustice, can we be surprised if wilder spirits retaliate with violence which is against the law? If the Home Rule Bill were passed in its present form, it would be law for Ulster as well as for the rest of Ireland. But Unionists urge Ulster to disobey the law even by force of arms and at the cost of civil war. Is not this admitting that the breach of an unjust law is the last resort of those who have no other means of obtaining justice? We have no right to force the Irish people to obey unjust laws. We must first see that the laws are in harmony with that consciousness of fairness which is found in the great mass of every civilised people.

The laws which the Irish find most difficulty in obeying are those which concern the land. In England we have few troubles of this kind. When William the Norman conquered this island, he claimed all the land as his own

property. Since his time no one has any estate whether large or small in English land which does not derive from the favour of the Crown, that is, from the voice of Parliament. This fundamental maxim, whilst it places all English property in land under the control of the law, does away more completely than in any European country with those reminiscences of corporate property in the soil which, so far as we know, are common to all Aryan races. In England the people have no strong desire to possess the soil, they are willing to rent it from others or to work upon it for a daily wage.

In Ireland, as in most European countries, the sentiment is different. Absentee landlords, known to their tenants only by the yearly tribute they exact, have possessed large tracts of Irish soil. Forests have been cleared, mountains have been fertilised, bogs have been drained, by the labour of poor peasants continued for many years, and the landlords have enjoyed the full advantage of the increased value of the soil. The first desire of an Irishman is to possess land. It is his natural means of gaining a living, the first bank in which he thinks of depositing his savings. Further, in many parts of the country the recollection of corporate property in land has not died out, a form of property which we disregarded when we settled Ireland, which we neglected a second time when we

settled Bengal, in both cases committing acts of great injustice and handing over to proprietors who had no claim to them, estates which were not ours to give. To many Irishmen, land laws are laws founded upon injustice and enforced by tyranny. Had these grievances not been recognised by an English Parliament, there would have been no need to pass an Irish Land Act. Before we talk of forcing the Irish to obey the common law we must be sure that the law which is in harmony with our moral sense is also in accordance with theirs, and that by exacting the last penny of a legal debt we are not violating the fairness from which all law derives its title to respect.

England has long tried to govern Ireland by the supremacy of an alien race and an alien religion. Laws which do not commend themselves to the consciences of the people have been enforced by a power which was foreign to their sympathies and did not touch their affections. Coercion will be a continuance of this process; law, as Englishmen understand it, but such a law as Irishmen reject, will be maintained by the same hateful force, and will have to be maintained by means which have become the more odious as a hope has been excited of escape from them. If coercion is to succeed it must be strong and continuous, it must be carried out persistently to a well-considered end. Is there any likelihood of such coercion being applied by an

English Government? If the Tories were to begin it the Liberals would not continue it, and no experience of the past teaches us that one party will remain for a long period in office. Coercion would be alien to the opinion of many Englishmen and to that of almost all foreign nations whose good opinion we care to obtain. Unionists must surely admit that if England and Ireland are to remain under the same Parliament they must be governed by the same laws.

If Coercion is impossible, nothing remains but Home Rule, that is, a recognition of the principle that people are best governed when they govern themselves. Unfortunately, Liberals are now bewildered by two conflicting kinds of Home Rule, the Home Rule of Mr. Gladstone and the Home Rule of Mr. Chamberlain.

It may be urged that it is the extremity of rashness to deliver a country to the government of those men who have hitherto made themselves notorious either by breaking or evading the law. How can we intrust Ireland to the hands of boycotters and murderers, to those who avow a deadly hatred to England, and assault her with weapons drawn from any source however tainted? We could not do this unless we trusted the patriotism of the patriots. If this long-continued agitation verging almost on rebellion has been inspired by mere selfish ambition, mere love

of notoriety or aggrandisement, we could not move one step in delegating the government to such hands. But if there is in the hearts of the National party a strong love for their country, a sincere desire to see her rich and prosperous, we may trust that this spark of generous enthusiasm and high resolve will conquer the baser passions which have been aroused in the struggle.

The Irish people trust these men; Ireland believes that they are her friends. They have indeed endured much on her behalf. We may believe therefore that any power which they may obtain will be used to the best of their ability for her good. But in delegating any measure of power we must rely on the steadying force of responsibility. Power without this might be used ineffectually and wrongly; but where the heart and the purpose is sound, responsibility will strengthen the character and turn the restless agitator into a calm and dignified statesman.

HERE LIES THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO SCHEMES. THE HOME RULE OF ONE GIVES GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY; THE OTHER IMPOSES NONE AT ALL. MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME, AS FAR AS WE KNOW IT, WOULD TURN EACH IRISH PROVINCE INTO AN ENLARGED MUNICIPALITY. IT WOULD GIVE "AN AUTONOMY OF GAS AND SEWAGE,"—it would offer no objects for the interest and ambition of the best Irishmen. They would remain at Westminster

conducting or impeding Imperial affairs; the provincial councils would be left to the bickerings of third-rate men: they would be larger editions of the vestry or the town council. On the other hand, a Parliament such as Mr. Gladstone would create would offer the noblest field of action to every patriotic Irishman. The best minds of this generation would be intrusted with the regeneration of their country; all that could make her rich and prosperous would be in their hands. Cold indeed and SELFISH must be the CITIZENS who would NOT WILLINGLY DEVOTE THEMSELVES TO SUCH A TASK. Is it then credible that the first step of such a Parliament would be to drive out the very Irishmen whose assistance would be most required? When the whole problem of raising the wealth and intelligence of Ireland is before it, will a Parliament expel those in whom wealth and intelligence reside? Or would those who are rich and able, who have been friends to the English rule, but who still are Irishmen, leave their country at this crisis of its fate, when the brightest prospect is open before it? MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S HOME RULE WOULD DO NOTHING BUT GIVE THE SHADOW OF POWER TO THOSE WHO CARE TO TAKE IT, LEAVING THEM AT EVERY TURN TO RUN TO ENGLAND FOR ASSISTANCE AND TO ABUSE HER FOR WHAT SHE GIVES. It would leave the Irish members at Westminster, still to hold the balance between our two great

parties, and still unsatisfied because the destinies of their country were not placed in their hands.

A statutory Parliament would not only give scope to the abilities of every patriotic Irishman, but would call back from beyond the seas Irishmen who have devoted their lives and powers to the service of other countries. In these two schemes we see THE VAST SUPERIORITY OF THE SCHOOL IN WHICH MR. GLADSTONE HAS BEEN TRAINED TO THAT FROM WHICH MR. CHAMBERLAIN HAS EMERGED. If Cobden's statesmanship was determined by his bringing up and by the circumstances of his life, Mr. Chamberlain's is still more narrowly limited. As a county is not the mere enlargement of a town, a country is not only the development of a county. Mr. Gladstone who has passed a long life in the conduct of Imperial affairs, knows what are the essentials of government, what tasks call out the energies and steady the moral purpose of ambitious men. Mr. Chamberlain's Home Rule would not content the Irish for a day. If there ever was a time when they would have accepted it, it would have been merely as a better standing point for future agitation.

Yet how can the Home Rule which we advocate imply separation? What a gulf is there between Ireland governed by its own subordinate Parliament, and Ireland with its own army and navy, its own ambassadors and

consuls, as much alien to England as France or Belgium! Whilst Ireland is the stepping-stone to America and Canada, we cannot let her go, we cannot allow her to sell her ports to foreign nations, or enter into alliances which would be contrary to English interests. There is no fear of this. From the very moment that we give to Ireland the conduct of her own affairs, the spring of affection and gratitude will rise in her bosom and the tie between mother and daughter will grow stronger every day. Therefore there is a plain issue before us—Coercion or Home Rule. No Liberal can support the first; no Liberal should doubt in what sense he will support the second—whether he will deal out to Irishmen with a niggardly hand the least he can give them, the petty functions of a county board guarded and guided at every step by superior authority, or invest them with the conduct of the destinies of their whole country, THE GUIDANCE OF WHICH WILL STEADY THE MOST RECKLESS HAND, AND SOBER THE MOST EXCITED BRAIN.

OSCAR BROWNING.

HON. WALTER JAMES, M.P.

I ALWAYS remember Mr. Gladstone is only human. I should say, on the whole, I follow him, not because "HE IS A CHIP OF THE OLD BLOCK, BUT THE OLD BLOCK ITSELF."

WALTER H. JAMES.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

It would hardly do to answer the question "Why do I follow Mr. Gladstone?" by saying "But I don't," and yet this would be strictly accurate, in one sense. The real truth is, I am not a good follower of any one man, having a will of my own; and, indeed, if I have followed any man, it has been John Bright. But, let it be taken for granted that the question means, "Why do you follow Mr. Gladstone *now*, and specially in view of his proposals with regard to Ireland?" then I am your man; for I have no hesitation about hearty adhesion to-day. Why?

Because I have believed for fifteen years that the only way to get peace and order and prosperity in Ireland is to leave the Irish people

to make the best of their own country, without any more of our masterful or selfish pottering with their affairs.

Because I think that one of the great wants of Ireland is a system of Home Government which will bring together factions which now misrepresent and hate one another, only because they live in antagonistic camps, and are without common national duties or responsibilities.

Because the giving to the Irish people the responsibilities and duties of Home Government will lead to the extinction of dynamiters, moonlighters, and riotous Orangemen, and gradually bring out and employ all that is best in the Irish character.

Because, so far from snubbing and repressing national sentiment anywhere, I would have us encourage it, and rejoice to see it developing and asserting itself, even in unlovely forms, for the ugliest political cygnet may develop into the loveliest of political swans.

Because events seem to have steadily led up to Mr. Gladstone's proposals; and, to try to stop Home Rule in Ireland now, is like trying to stop history in process of being made.

Because the great majority of the Irish people want Home Rule, under the intense conviction that they can do better for themselves than we can do for them.

Because we have done wrong so long in Ireland, and have failed so often, that the time has fully come for letting a wretched and

discontented people work out its own salvation if it can.

Because the leaders of the Irish people have shown the tenacity, discretion, tact, constructive faculty, administrative talent, and ability to rule, which Ireland will need in carrying out Mr. Gladstone's plan.

Because, to give Home Rule to Ireland just now would be an act of good-will on the part of England, which would bear good fruit among a sensitive, affectionate, and generous-hearted people.

Because the democracy of England has now a mind to be kind and just, and to act a brotherly part towards the democracy of Ireland ; and Mr. Gladstone's Bills would be the best expression of that.

Because Mr. Gladstone is a kind of prophet in relation to the advances of Humanity : his fervency of nature, his keenness of insight, and his intense sensitiveness, giving him the gift of perception in a high degree, even to the frequent discernment of things to come. And I think he sees farther than most men now.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

REV. SAMUEL COX, D.D.

I WOULD give autonomy to the Irish mainly because, (1) After preaching the doctrine of Nationality to others, I would not myself be a castaway ; and (2) because I believe you can only make men free by setting them free ; and that to train men for freedom by keeping them under tutors and governors is as though you should train boys for manhood by keeping them boys.

I do not expect that the Irish, when set to govern themselves, will make no blunders, or even that they will commit no crimes. I sometimes fear that they will go near to ruining the country — at least commercially. But I do not see how men are to be taught the seriousness and responsibility of life and action except by being suffered to reap the results of their errors and crimes, and to eat the fruit of their own doings. Is not that the way in which the Almighty Ruler of the Universe governs and trains us all ?

S. Cox.

VISCOUNT KILCOURSIE, M.P.

THE upper classes in Ireland have been unfortunately educated into the belief that their position and property are better guarded by trust in the English people than by trust in the people amongst whom they live ; the result has unfortunately been that class has been set against class, religion against religion, landlords against tenants, employers against employed, and *vice versâ*. Our object should be to teach all classes in Ireland that they must in the future be inter-dependent, as in England, so that while they will still look to England for defence against a foreign foe, and to the Crown of England as to a Common Centre, and the Parliament of England as the centralizing power, binding the various parts of the Empire securely together, by retaining an absolute control over all imperial interests, they must learn to work in harmony with each other, and to legislate for their own country in all matters purely local and exclusively Irish.

KILCOURSIE.

REV. BROOKE LAMBERT, Vicar of Greenwich.

I FOLLOW Mr. Gladstone in his Irish policy from those same considerations which have made me by profession a clergyman, and by education a Liberal. My Liberalism has grown with my religion, and seems to guide me here. It is because I find the opposition to the Bill based mainly on the fact that the Irish having behaved badly England is to show no generosity to them, that I have been unable to follow the bulk of my friends. AS A CHRISTIAN I AM TAUGHT TO LOVE MY ENEMIES, AND TO DO GOOD TO THEM THAT HATE ME. As a man I am sensible that the belief in a God who loves men without respect of their loveableness, nay, in despite of their unloveliness, has been the great moving power in religion. I believe that trust will in the long run overpower unfriendliness. THE IRISHMEN ARE MEN. To these *à priori* considerations I add two : 1st. The alternative, coercion is a weapon the edge of which is already blunted with over use. 2nd. Wherever nations acting under the impulse of selfishness have been compelled to adopt a policy like that of the Irish Bill that policy has succeeded.

I hail Mr. Gladstone's Bill as the conscious expression of a CHRISTIAN POLICY from a man whose practical sagacity is only equalled by his religious earnestness.

BROOKE LAMBERT.

J. GUINNESS ROGERS.

MR. GLADSTONE commands my sympathy for his Irish policy, because I recognise in it not only a LOFTY SUPERIORITY TO THE PREJUDICES OF NATION, RELIGION, AND CLASS, but also because I see in it the master of a far-seeing and courageous statesmanship. He has, Mr. Matthew Arnold notwithstanding, shown extraordinary insight in perceiving that the time has come for a bold measure, which would have in it some promise of finality. He saw that the Irish party were too strong to listen to any feeble suggestions of compromise, and that in England there was a strong and growing opinion in favour of a generous settlement. The last point was the more doubtful of the two, but the event has abundantly justified his forecast. The defeat of his Bill is by no means surprising. The marvel is that it found so many supporters. No measure so sweeping has ever been proposed to Parliament, and yet it has at once reached a position which has only been secured for other great reforms by years of struggle, and after a series of defeats, which have prepared the way for ultimate victory.

I have been for a quarter of a century a humble follower of Mr. Gladstone. I have admired him for the same qualities which have earned for him the undying hate not only of

the Tory party, but of society at large. Of the defenders of class privilege of every kind, and now of the whole generation of "superior persons." I honour him as one of the few statesmen who have sought to carry Christian principle into political life, and to follow a policy of righteousness in national as much as in private affairs. It has been a misfortune for him that so many who sympathise in this view have confounded honesty of purpose with infallibility in judgment. This tendency has doubtless been strengthened by the unreasoning and malignant passion with which he has been assailed, but not the less has it been unfortunate in its influence. For myself, I have sometimes differed from his policy, but I have always had implicit confidence in the purity of his patriotism, and his anxious desire to do the right. These characteristics I find in his Irish measures. I confess myself unable to conceive of any motive which could induce him to undertake such a task, except a sincere patriotism. That he is desirous to associate his name with a grand work of conciliation which shall be a blessing to both peoples I do not doubt. No nobler ambition could stir the heart of a patriotic statesman, and in order to do this service he has thrown himself, at seventy-six years of age, into a conflict the anxiety and turmoil of which might have deterred politicians still in all the vigour of their manhood. His

proposals are in harmony with the spirit of the policy. They exhibit a complete grasp of the situation; they are daring and yet show a wise regard for the difficulties of the situation, and the prejudices and fears of the classes who may feel themselves menaced by the contemplated changes; above all, they are conceived in a sympathetic spirit and are singularly generous. Mr. Gladstone's Liberalism has always been based on trust of the people, and he is distinguished from other politicians even of the Liberal party by the consistency with which he acts on this sentiment. Mr. Goschen distrusts the democracy everywhere; Lord Hartington trusts the English but distrusts the Irish people, and Mr. Bright seems, to some extent, to share this feeling; Mr. Gladstone has confidence in both, and in this will be found one main element of his strength at the coming election.

But my allegiance to the great Liberal chief is not a blind submission. I emphatically protest against the comparison, so frequent of late, of the Liberal party, to an army, when accompanied by the suggestion that every man is bound to follow the leader. The essence of Liberalism is independence, and this unwise use of a figure makes independence impossible. I believe in the principle of the Home Rule Bill, but I hold also that the mode of its application still remains to be discussed. The enemies of the Bill which has just

been rejected branded it as a measure of separation. That certainly is not what Mr. Gladstone intended it to be. But it is a matter of opinion whether the plan proposed in his Bill is that which would best have secured his own purpose. The Prime Minister has no more leaning to separation than Mr. Chamberlain, and if that be once granted the difference between the two schemes is one of method only, and not of principle.

The vote against the second reading proceeded on the contrary assumption, and was in my judgment a fatal mistake in policy. Practically it meant that Radicals who accept the principle of Home Rule could not trust Mr. Gladstone to maintain the unity of the Empire. I have the opposite feeling. I believe him to be a better BECAUSE A WISER UNIONIST THAN LORD SALISBURY OR LORD HARTINGTON, AND SO I GIVE HIM HEARTY SUPPORT.

J. GUINNESS ROGERS.

A COLLOQUY.

By MRS. BATESON, CAMBRIDGE.

A. What an absurdity is all this scheme of Home Rule !

B. That can hardly be an absurdity for which successive generations have toiled, lived and died.

A. A plague on those Irish ! it were a blessed thing if one could wake up some fine morning and find their island had gone to the bottom of the sea.

B. I have heard that pious wish expressed before. Say something more original.

A. I will say what is true though not new : they are a nation of robbers and murderers.

B. At least they are not a nation of slaves.

A. Who wants them to be slaves ?

B. You do ; when you insist that they shall be ruled by those who despise them.

A. At all events you will admit that they are not fit to govern themselves.

B. That remains to be proved. All that has been proved hitherto is England's unfitness to govern them.

A. Turbulent, discontented rascals !

B. You mean a people of indomitable spirit, which all the persecutions, the poverty, the repression of centuries have not been able to quell.

A. A spirit which leads them to set all law at defiance, and to connive at every crime.

B. Do you then seriously maintain that the people of Ireland are made of some special lump of foulest clay? some mire dug from a pit in hell? Are they not moulded of the same stuff as other men?

A. It would seem as though they were not.

B. I say this *false seeming* shows the measure of our crime against them. Denying our right to impose laws upon them they take delight in defying the symbols of our authority; we cause their moral sense to rot off at the root, because they associate the ideas of law and of tyranny together.

That they are intensely human and not devilish is shown by numerous traits of goodness; to take one instance, see the love of country they carry with them across the ocean; think of the efforts many of them make to send something back to parents and friends in Ireland.

A. Whatever virtues the Irish have, gratitude is not of the number. Have we not a claim on their gratitude for the kindness and unstinted charity we showed them in their time of trouble?

B. Oh, Mrs. Partington trying to dry up the sea with her mop! Britannia playing the Lady Bountiful to Ireland's woes, when those woes were of her own creating!

A. Of *our* creating? You speak in parables

The famine was a visitation of Providence ; it was through no fault of ours that the potato fields turned to ashes in a single night.

B. Here we have the whole thing in a nutshell ; let us come to plain facts of history. From the days of Queen Elizabeth. . . .

A. What is the use of raking up old tales about the days of Elizabeth ? What we want are the facts of to-day.

B. To understand the facts of to-day we must know the causes of those facts. For hundreds of years, then, down to the time of the Union, England made it her business to destroy one by one every budding Irish industry ; every source of wealth was cut off by statute. The Irish tried sending over live cattle to England ; a law was passed forbidding this. They then sent the meat in the form of salted provisions ; a prohibitory tax was imposed to stop this. Then the hides alone were sent ; this scheme was overthrown by a heavy tax being put on the leather. Cattle being put out of the market, sheep-farming was resorted to ; the same results followed.

A. Still, while they had mutton to eat and wool to manufacture, they were not to be pitied ; they could be snug and self-sustaining.

B. Their watchful guardian England was equal to the occasion. She prohibited the manufacturing of wool, and in the time of William III. 20,000 manufacturers left the

island. Everything was banned; the trade in silk, trade in candles, and other articles; nothing were these unhappy people allowed to turn their hands to. Cruel, cruel England!

A. Your story comes down to just two hundred years ago. We all did many things then which none of us would do now.

B. What did we do in 1800 in order to secure the Union? Those were days of great political corruption, and England's wealth and power afforded her the means of bribing Ireland's needy men of eloquence and genius when they might have been formidable to the Government.

A. However all this might be, I repeat that we could not have foreseen or prevented the famine which began in 1845, lasted for years, and gave rise to the most terrible misery.

B. The famine was foretold as certain to ensue from the people being shut off from every resource, and driven upon the land as their sole means of subsistence. Mark too the nature of the compact between landlord and tenant; the former took the corn for rent, paying the tenant's labour in potatoes. When the famine came, the golden grain was the landlord's, dust and ashes remained to the tenant.

It was a far cry to London, and the Irish distress was used as a Parliamentary ninepin, to be stuck up or knocked down as happened

to suit party strife. No wonder the Nationalist party at last was formed, and has become the nation's hope.

A. But you talk as if every one in Ireland were crying out for Home Rule; this is by no means the case.

B. The great towns in England where Irishmen congregate evince the strongest possible desire for Home Rule; and in Ireland eighty-six Nationalist members returned to Parliament last election supply tolerably strong evidence of the desire being general.

A. In great measure that was the work of the agitators; they terrorised the constituencies in spite of the ballot, and forced them to send Home Rulers to Parliament, notwithstanding their express desire to the contrary. St. Patrick once cleared the land of serpents, but the saints and the *new* vipers are all in a league together.

B. Tell me, then; if the Ulstermen were so scared last October, how come they to be so mettlesome at the present moment?

A. They have plucked up a little courage through sheer despair. They think that by the new-fangled scheme everything would be taken from them.

B. Everything? and what right has a minority to be in possession of everything?

A. Pray consider; the Protestant minority represents all the intellect, all the wealth, all the industry.

B. Yes, every one knows they have secured to themselves all posts of dignity, authority, and power, making for instance the county local government throughout Ireland a ridiculous farce. Is this wise? Is it just?

A. You appear to have developed a sudden affection for the Roman Catholic Church. I thought you had a great dislike. . .

B. I greatly dislike giving the Catholics the advantage of pointing the finger at Protestant selfishness.

A. On your own showing it would be very rash in us to give them the chance of paying off old scores. If we wronged the Irish in times past, if we annihilated their commerce, slew their industries, sucked the marrow from their land and left it bare as a bone, we can never expect to be other than foes.

B. Not so. The crimes of England, committed in the name of law and order, have been heinous in the highest degree. But the Irish know well that every debt cannot be paid to the uttermost. They know that the connection with England is in a thousand ways vital to them. Give them the power they wish of managing their own affairs, and trust them not to commit political suicide.

A. It strikes me that their demand arises in great measure from mere sentiment.

B. There is something in it far more serious than that. But granting that there is some

sentiment in the matter, all the better is it for us. With sentiment to work upon we can pay our debt to Ireland partly in the confession of error. Honour looms large in Ireland's eyes.

A. Are we to trail our honour in the dust that hers may be satisfied?

B. We honour ourselves most when we recognise the claims of others.

A. If we give way to them they will think we are afraid. No, we must whip the hounds into their kennel.

B. A fine sort of courage truly, to be afraid of seeming afraid! "*This conscience doth make cowards of us all.*"

A. If you can drive *that* idea into us and make us believe we are acting like cowards or bullies, why . . . something may come of it.

B. All foreign countries look upon us as tyrants in this matter, and Ireland I think will attract great sympathy through the excellent spirit she has shown since Mr. Gladstone announced his message of peace.

A. I admit there has been an absence of the "brag" one might have looked for. Somebody has been giving them good advice, and they have somehow had the sense to take it.

B. The fact is we have a golden moment in our hand, and what we do now can be done with a good grace. Since we abolished slavery we have had no such heaven-born chance as

this. Let us seize it and make ourselves shine among the nations; let us listen to Nature knocking at our hearts, and set our sister free!

SAMUEL STOREY, M.P.

MR. GLADSTONE'S proposals seem to me wise and statesmanlike because they are boldly shaped with regard to the measure of mischief we have to overcome. Moreover, I know what my feelings as an Englishman would have been if the positions of the two countries had been reversed, and if the Irish had persisted in governing or misgoverning us as we unwisely have persisted in misgoverning them. *That* settles the controversy for me.

SAMUEL STOREY.

LADY FLORENCE DIXIE.

THE Home Rule Bill brought in by Mr. Gladstone has been defeated by a large majority, when one considers the efforts made to induce Liberal dissentients to give their assent to the principle of self-government for Ireland, by voting for it. Writing to a Nationalist member some two weeks or so before its second reading came on, I expressed

my belief that it could not pass. The member in question took an opposite view, and seemed confident of success. The belief I then expressed has been abundantly realised. Why did I express that view? Because I read the letters on the wall as clearly as they were written, letters forming the words *Not yet*.

I do not say that Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill was inopportune as coming too soon, for it should have come long ago. But it came very suddenly, and took by surprise men who could not grasp the fact that unless Ireland was to relapse into agitation and chaos, and much worse, Home Rule was indispensable to the safety of the true unity of our disunited kingdoms.

With the foresight of a true statesman Mr. Gladstone grasped the situation. Work in the House of Commons was practically at a standstill. The eighty-six Irish members rendered serious business impossible, for they were there for one purpose only, and that purpose was to force the Irish Question on the House and keep it there until it had been met and answered in accordance with the demands of the Irish people. Putting aside justice, expediency rendered it imperative to end the tension that existed between the two countries, and to render the unwholesome state of agitation that had gone on so long impossible.

The House of Commons, by a large majority, has proved that, unlike Mr. Gladstone, it has *not* grasped the situation, that it has *not* been able to look ahead and behold the inevitable, and that in refusing to affirm the principle of Home Rule, which Mr. Gladstone declared a vote recorded in favour of the Bill would simply mean, it has demonstrated its inability to look into the glass of Futurity, and read that which *must come*.

I am not one of those who unreservedly accepted as final the Bill drafted by Mr. Gladstone. Though I recognised in it a splendid effort to end the strife of centuries, and to heal the wounds inflicted by the misgovernment of successive generations, I did not sympathise with the clause excluding the representation of Irishmen in the Imperial Parliament. As an Imperial Federalist, how could I? Yet nevertheless, when Mr. Gladstone made it clearly understood that this clause would not be insisted upon, and that in any future consideration of the Bill it might be reconstructed, I cannot see why members, who have all along made the exclusion of Irish representation the peg on which to hang their dissentient votes, should not have accepted this assurance and assisted in passing Mr. Gladstone's Bill on an unequivocal understanding of this sort.

Opponents of the Bill have declared it to

be dead. Yes, it may be dead, but its soul liveth and will never die. Have we no such word as resurrection? What does it mean, if not waking to life again glorified and purified? The principle and essence of the Bill lives on triumphant, and will yet force their title-deeds upon the unwilling sense of the Westminster Assembly. As I wrote to Mr. Gladstone on April 7th, on the eve of his introduction of the Home Rule Bill, so I repeat now:—

“THE CROWNING EFFORT OF YOUR LIFE CANNOT FAIL. IT IS DOOMED TO SUCCESS. EVEN IF THE SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS AND BIGOTRY OF MEN FOIL THE FIRST ATTEMPT, YOU HAVE SOWN A SEED THAT CANNOT PERISH. IT IS LINKED WITH YOUR NAME, AND WHEN REALISED WILL BE YOUR OWN, EVEN THOUGH OTHER HANDS MAY FOSTER AND NURTURE ITS GROWTH.”

I do not say these are the words of prophecy, for it needs not much intelligence or foresight to foretell the inevitable. But I think my words foreshadow more or less the ultimate result of Mr. Gladstone's great effort to bring peace to Ireland, and although he may never live to see the day, he may rest assured that no matter who carries a Home Rule Bill in the future, the glory of the measure, the freedom which it will bring to that country, the cessation thereby of the eternal disputes between the sister islands which it will occasion, will be due to the “step in advance” which his

foresight and sagacity has induced him to make.

Over the prostrate form of the Home Rule Bill gloat the factions and parties that have occasioned its fall. What are they gloating about? What is the measure of their triumph? They have defeated Mr. Gladstone, but they have not vanquished the cause on whose behalf he took up arms. Nor will they. Great generals have often met with reverses at the commencement of a campaign, finishing triumphantly in the end. Robert Bruce's opening battle was disaster, but his final one was overweening in its success. Mr. Gladstone is defeated, not vanquished, and this defeat has probably greater significance of future success than if he had carried the measure over its second reading.

I who write this have been all my life a Conservative, and by no means an admirer of many of Mr. Gladstone's political *coup de mains*; many and many a time has my pen declaimed against them, but I hold that in supporting the principle of Home Rule for Ireland Mr. Gladstone has adopted a strong Conservative measure, and that in refusing to sustain him Conservatism has forsaken its colours. It has allied itself with a Whig-Radical faction to defeat a measure the whole essence of which is Conservative, and by doing so has falsified its position for the sake of a momentary gain. An appeal to the country is the result of their

action. If they come into office what is their policy ? Lord Salisbury has said that twenty years of strong government will put everything right. But who is to carry on this strong government for twenty years ? and does Lord Salisbury in his innermost heart believe that his policy is possible ? The strong government of Lord Salisbury in Ireland means pure and simple "coercion," for he knows that the Irish people will never rest content until they have obtained their heart's desire. They *will* agitate, and this if suppressed will lead to violence, and violence if met by repression will breed secret societies and dynamite and murder, for it is an acknowledged fact that when lawful agitation is suppressed, and men who work for a just cause by lawful means are prevented from prosecuting their work, they make way for those who adopt ways and means and methods somewhat contrary to law and order.

Whether a Conservative or a Unionist Administration is formed, on the result of the appeal to the constituencies being made known, either the one or the other will have to face the Irish Question. Then Mr. Gladstone's policy will speak for itself, and make itself felt, in spite of all opposition, while his great effort will amply justify itself. Time will prove that not only Ireland, but England, Scotland, and Wales will each and all require to manage their own affairs, unless every

matter of interest and importance and necessity is to be at a deadlock and standstill for the sake of some all-absorbing question that excludes and neglects every other subject but its own.

Mr. Gladstone will now ask the country whether it assents to Home Rule or not. Those who believe with Lord Hartington and Mr. Bright can honestly answer, No. But what is to be the reply of those who, like Mr. Chamberlain and others, have assented to the principle while refusing to allow the exclusion of Irish representation in Imperial affairs? Will they join Lord Hartington and his Conservative allies, and vote dead against the principle? If they do they will surrender their liberty of conscience and their right to an opinion of their own, and give their support to that which at heart they really condemn.

I venture to predict that if men go to their constituents with the question so jumbled up as it at present is, that a House of Commons more motley than the present one will be returned. What then? Simply more confusion and another dissolution will result, and issues be worse confounded. All this might have been avoided if Mr. Chamberlain and those with him who assent to the principle of Home Rule had assisted in carrying the second reading, on the distinct understanding that they committed themselves to nothing further than the principle in question, reserving to them-

selves perfect freedom to deal with the Bill in its future stages. Very distinctly Mr. Gladstone made it known in his speech at the Foreign Office that he threw open the door to this course, and from this offer he never rescinded a particle, though interested enemies of this splendid effort wilfully and persistently misrepresented him.

Ah, well ! Their action has awoken once more the fiends of strife, and awakened again echoes which one would fain have hoped had for ever died. It is impossible to foretell how long the new passions aroused will war with the elements of peace, or when the bad feelings and misunderstandings and confused issues that have sprung up will be laid to rest.

A dream is often before me. It is a dream of a vast imperial home spreading itself in all quarters of the globe. It is a home of many states and kingdoms all knit together in true unity by the bond of contentment. Each state and kingdom has enthroned in its midst its own parliament, empowered to legislate for and control its own interests, while in the imperial pile at Westminster sits the real Imperial Parliament of Parliaments composed of representatives or delegates from all the various legislatures of that vast imperial home. Something tells me that that dream will soon become a great reality, and I believe that the acceptance of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, with a few modifications, would hasten it materially.

In any case, I think that if Mr. Gladstone's grand effort has effected nothing else, it has pushed to the front the great and glorious question of Imperial Federation.

Passion and party strife are now let loose upon us. Is there no mind amidst all that seething cauldron of excitement who will not pause and ponder on the fearful issue at stake? After seven hundred years of estrangement and antagonism a measure has been brought forward which, with some amendments, is endowed with the power to heal the wounds of centuries and effect a lasting reconciliation between England and Ireland. It has been struck down, and its enemies would annihilate it. Shall it be so? Will the people of this country also say, *No!* to Mr. Gladstone and to Ireland? I fear so, though I fain would hope not. If they do, another era of strife and chaos and bloodshed is before us, which will never cease until the policy and seed sown by Mr. Gladstone has spread its roots and asserted its undeniable right of recognition. He may never live to see that day, but I confidently predict that it will come, and *he knows it.*

While the strife goes on the sand in the hour-glass is running fast and the hands of Time's great clock are moving slowly round. They know no going back, and are subservient to no art or skill of man. Wasted hours and days cannot be recalled; as well might one

strive to stem the ebbing tide. Let this country then pause and meditate ere it recklessly casts away the precious opportunity that now presents itself, to give one final, unmistakable, and overwhelming support to the principle embodied in Mr. Gladstone's Bill—*i.e.*, the right of a nation to legislate for and guard its own interests.

If happily this is the answer of Great Britain to the appeal now made to it, then, indeed, a brighter dawn will burst upon us, heralding the sunburst of freedom that a nation has asked for and been refused for seven hundred years. After the tempest that has raged a great calm will fall, and in the peace and good fellowship engendered the curtain will fall on a stage whose ghastly tragedy we may hope never to see again.

FLORENCE DIXIE.

RECONCILEMENT OF TWO NATIONS.

PROFESSOR SIGERSON, M.D., F.R.U.I., Dublin.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM BEFORE US ? THE RECONCILIATION OF TWO NEIGHBOURING NATIONS. IN CONSIDERING SO GREAT A QUESTION, WITH A VIEW TO ITS SOLUTION IN A MANNER WHICH SHOULD BEST SUBSERVE THE WELFARE AND DIGNITY OF BOTH, IT IS REQUISITE TO STAND FREE FROM PRESENT PASSIONS, AND DEAL WITH IT NOT AS AN ADVOCATE, BUT AS AN UNBIASSED HISTORIAN. Now it is the function of an historian to determine the principles which have controlled the movements of nations and the circumstances which have helped to mould their characters and careers. Applying to the present the methods deduced from the gathered experience of the past, it ought not to be impossible to indicate the lines which, if followed into the future, should lead to conflict on the one hand, or to concord on the other.

That disaccord does exist between England and Ireland is obvious, that it tends to augment is the opinion of many, whilst no dispassionate mind can regard the continued political bickering of two such neighbours as

otherwise than highly detrimental to their respective interests and common welfare. The fundamental question which requires first to be noted and disposed of is this : Are these nations reconcileable ? If they are hindered from coming together in harmony by inherent qualities, or by antagonistic interests, then further discussion is idle, and the decision of the problem must rest with the stronger. It should be clear, however, that this would mean the diminution of the power and prestige of an empire divided against itself, which now and henceforth, more than ever in the past, requires the harmonious co-operation and united strength of all its members, in order that it may hold its high place against the industrial rivalry and the military re-organisation of foreign countries.

PART I.

THE OBSTACLES ALLEGED.

The ineradicable antagonism, if it exist at all, should be found in differences of race, religion, of commercial interests, or of modes of political thought and action. Such obstacles to a good understanding have been from time to time, and with more or less incoherence, alleged, but as a rule by passionate partisans.

An allegation of the kind presents, however, so simple and so facile an interpretation of a troublesome question (with an air of science about it too), that it is apt to be caught up by many, with whom it serves to cover a want of knowledge or a want of mind. It is necessary, therefore, to discuss these supposititious impediments in detail, but this shall be done with as much brevity as possible:—

RACIAL HOSTILITY A FIGMENT.

I. Racial hostility is a figment of recent introduction. Some forty years ago it occurred to certain ephemeral writers that the inhabitants of England were Anglo-Saxons, and those of Ireland Celts, and that Providence had pitted these races against each other as eternal foes. Both sides took up the war-cry, and a political dispute became an ethnological wrangle, little to the edification of true students of a yet undeveloped science. This modern myth still lingers, flickering up at times, but feebly, in comparison with its former flashes. Like other plausible explanations, it was quickly accepted and spread widely, because it was one of those fallacies which Verulam forbade. As a matter of fact, the populations of both countries are made up of similar elements, though in different proportions. The Celts of Britain did not vanish when the Saxons crossed the sea, and their

race was subsequently strengthened by the Celtic companions of the Normans. Norsemen invaded both countries and settled in each of them. Saxons were naturally more numerous in England, but, instead of bitter animosity being nurtured between them and the Irish Celts, the relations between Ireland and England were probably never so cordial as during the Saxon Heptarchy. Students from England—Saxon princes amongst them—were welcomed to Ireland; and scholars from Ireland were given high positions in England. That Connaught county, which has engendered the Land League, was known as the “Mayo of the Saxons.” Nor does history record testimony borne by one nation to the merits of another warmer or more affectionate than that borne by Saxon writers to the Irish: who, they declared, received all comers with a liberal welcome, and hospitably entertained them, giving them books to read, instruction in every art and science known, food and shelter, and all gratuitously. Nothing more, indeed, is required to expose the shame of modern scholarships, in tolerating this myth of an inherent racial animosity between Celt and Saxon, than to quote a phrase from the Saxon Bede describing the Irish as “an inoffensive people, always most friendly to the English nation—*gentem innoxiam et nationi Anglorum semper amicissimam.*” If not from the Saxons, whence should the inter-racial antagonism

arise? Not from the Norse element, for it existed in both countries. In Ireland, the Norse and Celtic princes considered race no barrier to intermarriage. Nor, notwithstanding the singular travesty of history exhibited by Irish writers on the subject, was the Battle of Clontarf a battle of races, seeing that the Norsemen of Dublin and the north were invited by the Irish of Leinster to assist them against Brian, who himself had Danish allies in his army. The Normans, laying hold of Ireland as they laid hold of England, cannot be charged with nurturing, on both sides of the Channel, a race-jealousy against themselves.

RACE FUSION A LAW.

In point of fact, the invaders soon became Irishmen, marrying and giving in marriage—Milesian invaders, Norse invaders, Norman invaders, all followed the same course. The planters of Elizabeth and of James I. fused in the same manner with the natives, and the offspring of Spencer, who devised sagely on the taming of Ireland, were found guilty of Irishism when Cromwell came. But the Ironsides themselves could not escape the inexorable law, and the children of Cromwell's troopers were discovered speaking no language but the Gaelic, and knowing no country but Ireland. No sarcasm against the theory of

racial antagonism could be so strong, nor any argument so convincing, as the bare record of the fact that those very efforts which engendered the Idea of Nationhood in modern times, which influence the present and must affect the future, took their origin and their force in the heart of the colonial Pale, amongst the descendants of men whose ancestors had crossed the Channel with Strongbow, with Cromwell, or but yesterday with William of Orange himself. Consequently we must eliminate the idea of an inherent antagonism of races, as being non-existent in fact—and this conclusion holds good, not only as between the populations of Ireland and England, but as amongst the various races which inhabit either country. Englishmen would regard, as fantastical, beyond the bounds of sanity, any theory which sought to demarcate political parties amongst them, on ethnological lines. Yet the inhabitants of England were formerly in feud and faction, when wave after wave of invaders surged over the land. The waves subsided in due time, and became inseparably mingled. So with Ireland. In neither country was it ever a question of race: it was simply and solely a question of New-comer and Native—the new-comer of one invasion being the native of the next. The Stranger wishes to take, the Resident to hold—when they have settled the matter by the sword they mingle and show a united front against new Strangers.

It is an error which slight observation discards, to suppose that members of a race must prefer others of its members and detest aliens : there is a charm in diversity which proves an attraction. Like goes not necessarily to like, but often to unlike. The internecine feuds between Celtic clans, and the internecine feuds between Saxon tribes were more vehement, virulent, and vindictive, than between either race and an alien race. On the other hand the force of attraction which drew together, with irresistible power, the various groups comprising the inhabitants of Ireland, can be measured by the laws which were passed to forbid their blending and communion, and by the failure of these laws.

It may, possibly, be alleged that the existence of such statutes was an evidence of racial hatred ; but a thorough investigation of the statutes of Ireland demonstrates that they were but part of the Conquest Code, which respected neither race nor religion.

CREEDS NOT COTERMINOUS WITH POLITICS.

II. It cannot be maintained that difference of creeds between two neighbouring peoples must prove an obstacle to their cordial understanding. The policy of the most pious courts has led them to form alliances or to sympathise with other courts professing adverse doctrines,

even when these courts were warring against powers whose religious faith was identical with that of the former.

THE IRISH NATURALLY TOLERANT.

“Cabinets are not baptised,” observed an Italian prelate, thereby indicating that alliances are made on grounds of material, not spiritual affinity. Then, it must be admitted by all that the Irish people never were persecutors in matters of faith. They made no martyrs amongst the propagandists of Christianity; they welcomed the Protestant fugitives from English Mary’s laws, housed and fed and held them harmless. Like the Athenians, they would have listened with curiosity to St. Paul speaking of the Unknown God, and questioned him with respect. Eager for the acquisition of knowledge, free of mind, subtle of intellect, fond of metaphysical disquisitions, not averse to sophistry, skilled in logomachy, ardent in debate, enthusiastic auditors of verse and oratory, they were, in fact, the Greeks of the West, heirs of Athens—not of Rome. They welcomed all comers to their schools, and they hastened to all centres of population, from Iceland to Italy, to dispute, to teach, and to found colleges. They gave but few hermits; being, though ascetic in habit, too social by temperament and too active intellectually for a solitary life.

For three centuries, from the fifth to the eighth, whilst Ireland was the University of Europe—they held the civilisation of the Continent in their hands. They taught everything known to mankind—but not persecution. Later still, in the middle ages, Irishmen founded the Scholastic Philosophy, but never any school of intolerance.

TWO PENAL CODES : A CATHOLIC CODE AGAINST IRISH CATHOLICS.

They have suffered persecution, but that has not taught them its art, but its odiousness. It is true they are but emerging from a penal code which banned their faith and their education so completely that the fathers of some yet alive had to learn their letters, by stealth, under the shadow of hedge-rows, or worship God on wooded hills, with sentinels posted around to give an alarm in case of the appearance of the agents of the Law. But the Irish people, who know that this was a Protestant penal code, know also that England was not Protestant but Catholic when the Anglo-Normans entered. They know that these slew their fathers with the sword in battle, or spared them no more in peace than others. They know, also, that these Catholic invaders established a penal code against them, so thorough and so sweeping that Catholic priests, friars, monks, and

nuns were expelled from their churches, abbeys, monasteries, and convents, because they were Irish,—that the natives of the land dared not enter its walled towns—that not only were Irish teachers, poets, and minstrels banished from the Pale, and Irish customs banned, but that intermarriage between the new-comers and the natives was proscribed. Heavy penalties, involving confiscation and death, followed on infractions of the laws, and the prelates of the Pale guarded this code of proscription by their spiritual thunders. Aware of these and other circumstances, it is perhaps explicable why Irish Catholics have not shown any excess of yearning for the conversion of England. The independence of their hierarchy, which is so dear to them, they feared might be overshadowed if there were an established Catholic Church of England.

POLITICAL UNION BETWEEN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT.

It has even been said that if England became Catholic, Ireland would become Protestant, but that is a baseless fancy, for the Irish Catholic's faith is founded not upon hatred, but upon conviction and love. It must be confessed, however, that there has long existed, and does still exist, a want of political sympathy between Irish and English Catholics (with some notable exceptions), whilst a close

political sympathy has long united a large party of English Protestants with the Irish Catholics. Then again, considered domestically, it will be observed that Irish Catholic constituencies—holding the most advanced and extreme views—have repeatedly selected Irish Protestants to represent them, whilst they have never chosen an English Catholic but once, and that to their mutual discontent. The probability is that the proportion of Protestant members (whose tendency is towards radicalism in politics) will increase, by the choice of those constituencies where the so-called proletariat or labour element predominates.

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS NOT CONTRADICTORY.

III. In what manner these two countries could become antagonistic by their commercial interests it is difficult to conceive. In former days, when a close network of protection wrapped the nations round, the interests of merchants caused them to watch with jealousy every similar industry and to narrow the mesh that might admit its products. Artisans were kept at home, and machinery was not exported until late days. Free trade, whatever be its other merits or demerits, has at least dissipated this trouble. In any case, the change of circumstances in the world's fortune has been so vast that neither of the two countries has any-

thing to apprehend from the other, whilst both have much to do to meet the competition of foreign nations. Ireland, as an agricultural country chiefly, has had to suffer, and will have to suffer, from the rivalry not of Britain but of America and Australia. England, as a manufacturing country chiefly, has to suffer, not from any Irish rivalry, but from the pressure of foreign products pouring in upon her from the New World and the Old. If Ireland succeeded in developing some manufactures the consequence would be, not certainly so much that they would compete with English products, as that they would compete with foreign products in the English market and abroad. If Ireland, for example, fostered the manufacture of sugar from beet-root, the growth of which would suit her population and her climate, where would the antagonism enter? It would serve England to purchase from Ireland at least as well as from France; and, England being Ireland's best customer, the ties of amity would be strengthened by the bond of interest. In the same way, if Ireland produced tobacco-leaf, as might be done with a careful arrangement of duties, the product would interfere with no English product, though it might displace some portion of the foreign supply with the British manufacturers in the British market. As for those manufactures in which England has a specialty, alike by the

accumulation of capital and experience, it is improbable that Irishmen would undertake to contest the possession of the market with her; if any did, the result could easily be borne with, for English manufacturers who have withstood the competition of those continental countries, where trade has been so fostered by their rich and powerful governments, would not be affected by the productions of a few manufacturers in Ireland.

CAPACITIES OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND COMPLEMENTARY. IRELAND'S FUNCTION.

It would, in fact, be quickly perceived that the capacities of these two countries are diverse and complementary. The Irish, with their higher artistic talents thoroughly developed, and their greater imaginative powers trained by a complete system of technical education, would find a market in Britain for faculties which are required by her to encounter continental competition in many branches. At home, the facilities of their presence would induce the extension of whatever artistic industries Ireland possesses, and the development of others. Of old, the *Opus hibernicum* was renowned over the Continent. The exquisite beauty of the articles of gold and silver in the Museum of the Royal Irish Academy indicates that, with fair advantages, we should not be driven to foreign countries

for artistic productions in the precious metals. Again, the unequalled illuminations of such works as the *Book of Kells* reveal a capacity for form, colour, and delicate manipulation which, if even now made proper use of, should prove a fortune to any country. That the capacity still remains is demonstrable, not only by the success of the students of the Dublin School of Art, in international competitions, but also by the marvellous lace-work produced by the poorest country girls in Irish cottages, labouring under innumerable disadvantages. If Irish boys had employment of a similar nature, suitable to their tastes, would they prove less skilful? Specimens of their carved wood recall a time when the *bois d'Irlande*, a few centuries ago, was frequent in French mansions, because of the beauty of its curious cabinet work. When a country can, in the department of high art, quote the names of Forde, Barry, Maclise, Hogan, MacDowell, Foley, and others, her potentiality for progress, in all that art can create or adorn, must be accepted. Is it not possible, and even highly probable that, with a regenerated Ireland, we need not be dependent on the East for articles such as China and Japan are pouring in, but be able to fabricate and export products where what has been termed the Oriental imagination of the Celt would, tempered and trained, excel the East itself in originality of invention, chastity of form, and harmony of colour?

The singular grace of the Belleek ware, manufactured under many drawbacks in a remote rural locality, is a sample of what might be accomplished were the conditions such as to foster and develop the application of art to industry. The climate of Ireland is excellent for the growth of some textile plants, such as flax and hemp, and better adapted for cotton-spinning than that of England, according to a manufacturer, owing to its greater moistness. Irish threads have already obtained a prominent place in the market. Water-power abounds. The country, however, does not offer large supplies of coal or minerals, and it is obvious that the chief industries of the nation should lie in the direction of the manufacture of products the value of which depends less upon the cost of the raw material than upon the art by which it is moulded.

ANTAGONISM ANTIQUATED.

The existence of an apprehension, more or less avowed, of the antagonism of the industrial and commercial interests of the two countries is a reminiscence of the antiquated views which dictated the exclusive laws of the last century. These laws are obsolete; they are not merely erased from the statute books, but their principles have been eradicated from the minds of legislators by the science of political economy. That their memory should

persist and raise alarms is not surprising, when we reflect that the fathers of many amongst us were alive when some of these monopolising laws were in vigour, and that not a few survive who felt their influence. Let me quote a clear, though concise, description of them, given by an English statesman of the period, Mr. Eden: the picture is instructive in itself, and suggestive of a more instructive moral:—

A PENAL CODE AGAINST IRISH INDUSTRY.

“If we were to state to an Irish gentleman,” wrote Mr. Eden, “the long-continued idleness and poverty which have prevailed over so large a proportion of his countrymen, he would probably answer: ‘All this may be very true, but the monopolising spirit of our sister kingdom is the cause of it: that spirit exercising itself upon Ireland in a very early stage of our civilisation, nipped her disposition to industry, and indeed made it impossible for her to become industrious. In the very infancy of our country, and while we were contenting ourselves with the exportations and sale of our cattle you made an act¹ to prohibit those exportations. We next gave our attention to the increase of our sheep, in order to export wool, but you forthwith prohibited the exportation of wool, and made it subject to forfeiture.² We then endeavoured

¹ 8 Eliz. c. 3.

² 13 & 14 Car. II. 18.

to employ and support ourselves by salting provisions for sale; but you immediately refused them admittance into England¹ in order to increase the rent of your lands. We next began the woollen manufacture; but it was no sooner established than destroyed; for you prohibited the exportation of manufactured woollens to any other place than England and Wales,² and this prohibition alone is reported to have forced twenty thousand manufacturers out of the kingdom. The Navigation Act³ had unwittingly, but kindly, permitted all commodities to be admitted into Ireland upon the same terms as into England: but by an act passed three years afterwards the exportation of any goods from Ireland into any of the Plantations (Colonies) was prohibited,⁴ and as if that had not sufficiently crippled the benefits given by the Navigation Act, we were soon afterwards forbidden to import any of the enumerated commodities from the Plantations into Ireland.⁵ This restriction, too, was much enforced by subsequent acts; and the list of enumerated goods was much increased. I say nothing of your regulations respecting glass, hops, sail-cloth, &c., and other inferior barriers to our commerce. We subsisted under all this, and under a drain also which has gradually increased upon us by remittances

¹ 18 Car. II. c. 2.² 10 & 11 Will. III. c. 10.³ 12 Car. II. c. 10.⁴ 15 Car. II. c. 7.⁵ 22 Car. II. c. 18.

to our own absentees, English mortgages, Government annuitants, and other extra-commercial purposes to the amount of half a million sterling annually, and though we retained no trade, but in linen and provisions, the latter has been under a three years' prohibition, during which period we lost the principal market for our own beef, though three-fourths of our people were graziers. Many of us, indeed, carried on a clandestine trade, and it was essential to our support, but that too has been checked, first by the revolt of the Colonies, and now by the war with France and Spain. Our annual remittances and debts to Great Britain now increase with our distress; our leases when they expire are raised by the absentees, the drain is become greater than we can supply. . . . We desire therefore Free Trade, otherwise our distress must, if possible, increase; and the conveniency of our ports will continue of no more use to us than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon."

It was freedom of trade, not Free Trade in the modern sense, which was required, and the three propositions brought in by the British Minister in 1779-80—in consequence of home and foreign troubles—indicate some of the cramping conditions. By these propositions Irish wool and woollen goods were allowed to be sent to the Continent; the ban was taken from the exportation of Irish glass, and the

obligation to import none but English glass was removed, as was the prohibition of trading with any of the British Colonies. But the inequality of duties, greatly in favour of Britain, was retained.

A PROTESTANT PENAL CODE AGAINST IRISH PROTESTANTS.

Now, with such a picture of prohibition before us, which certainly teaches a duty of reparation, it would seem to numbers a paradox to state that it affords no evidence of antagonism between Saxon and Celt, between the English and the Irish nations. This, however, is the historical truth. It was a contest amongst Englishmen essentially. The Irish people were no doubt indirectly affected by prohibitions which affected agricultural produce, but they stood aloof from the main issue, because they were permitted no part in it. When Mr. Eden refers to the "infancy of our country," he means the infancy of the English Colony in Ireland; his dates explain that his view extends to the Protestant Colony only. Now, during all that time Irish Catholics had nothing to do with manufactures; during most of it they could scarcely appear within walled towns, and were of course excluded from the guilds of tradesmen. In the latter portion of it, during the reign of Anne, they were

proscribed by a penal code so searching that, as a judge declared, a Catholic was not supposed so much as to breathe in the country.

Assistant-Commissioner Otway, in 1840, in his official report, stated that: "The handloom weavers, the clothiers (*i.e.*, clothworkers), the wool-combers, the dyers, the whitesmiths, and even the mariners in the south of Ireland were so exclusively Protestant that they would not allow a Roman Catholic apprentice to be received into any of their trades. The only branch of manufactures permitted to the 'mere Irish' was that of brogues and common shoes, and even this trade was not allowed to be carried on within the precincts of walled towns." "The exclusion of the Irish from all manufactures was rigorously continued." It is a constant commonplace of many Irish popular writers to cite the action of William in assenting to strike down the Irish woollen trade, as a ruinous blow dictated by intolerant hate of Ireland and the Irishry. It was not so. The linen trade had been long encouraged, and the woollen trade—which England claimed as her staple trade—had been discouraged in Ireland from Strafford's time. The English House of Lords represented to King William that living was so cheap, and the raw material so good across the Channel, that the cloth manufacture "doth invite your subjects in England, with their

families and servants to settle there," which was calculated to ruin the trade of England, to lower the value of lands, and to lessen the number of its inhabitants. Had King William III. and the English Parliament tolerated this transit and growth there would have been great Anglo-Protestant manufacturing settlements over the southern provinces. They struck them down with resolute recklessness, and at one blow drove 20,000 Anglo-Protestant artizans out of the colony to France and other places, where they were the means of setting up a great rival trade. The breakdown of the Colonial garrison, which abhorred them, was a direct gain to the Irish Catholics ; for the depression of either party at that time involved the elevation of the other. Britain, therefore, in crushing the Irish woollen manufactures, was not moved by an inveterate hostility, nor was the blow injurious to the Irish race. She was simply giving a modern representation of Saturn in the act of devouring his offspring.

PROSPERITY UNDER THE IRISH PARLIAMENT.

That manufactures revived, after liberty of commerce was obtained, under the judicious fosterage of the Irish Parliament, has been doubted, but it is unquestionable. Lord Chancellor Clare was no patriotic enthusiast, yet in 1798 he wrote :—"There is not a

nation on the face of the earth which has advanced in cultivation, in agriculture, in manufactures, with such rapidity, within the same period as Ireland." The bankers of Dublin and the guild of merchants concurred, passing resolutions to the effect that:—"The commerce of Ireland has increased, and her manufactures have improved beyond example, since the independence of this kingdom was restored by the exertions of our own countrymen in 1782."

POST-UNION DECAY, AND ITS CAUSES.

The abolition of a fostering parliament in Dublin, and the consequent flight from that city of Lords and Commoners, emptying it of a wealthy and fashionable society, gave, no doubt, a terrible shock to its trade. But manufacturing industries persisted, and would in all probability have recovered and increased had there not been four undermining causes to sap their stability. Both in England and in Ireland manufactures had been fostered by protection-duties and by bounties; but when the time for the abolition of this system came, the Irish manufacturers, having enjoyed it for but a very short time, had not accumulated so much capital and were not so well able to stand alone. Secondly, the policy of exclusivism separated the manufacturing classes and interests from

those of the general mass of the population, so that neither section had the support of the other. Strikes amongst the exclusivist operatives were necessarily disastrous, as they held a monopoly of skilled labour. Thirdly, the wretched condition of the land-question prevented capital from accumulating for investment in developing small or increasing great industries, whilst the contempt of the rural gentry for trade, common to other countries, was most injurious in a land where towns with a mercantile class were comparatively small. Lastly, one of the most potent of all factors was the invention of various labour-saving machines, which created a revolution in manufactures. Crowds of workmen were thrown out of employment in England, and serious riots ensued; in Ireland the smaller manufacturers appear to have subsided silently. They had not the capacity of invention, nor the capital to procure the improved machinery, if it were procurable. All these conditions peculiarly affected the southern provinces, whilst the Linen manufacture (on which bounty was paid until 1830) remained and developed, amidst a population which had security of tenure and which was not affected by the political tempests that—owing to the long delay of urgent reforms—devastated the rest of Ireland.

POLITICAL ACTION IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND
PARALLELED.

IV. The question of this resistance to reforms, required for the welfare of the country, leads to a brief consideration of the modes of political thought and action in both countries. Instead of differing radically, owing to ethnological or other causes, as some fancy, they show a curious parallelism. Part of this is due to the fact that the connection between the two countries, in political movements, was closer than is generally supposed. The Society of United Irishmen sprang from the Anglo-Irish colony, and was strong in its strongholds, Belfast and Dublin. It had its counterparts in the English "Corresponding Society" and in the "United Britons," or "United Englishmen"; and, as regards Scotland, in the "Friends of the People" and the "United Scots." Emmet's movement was connected with an English revolutionary movement. Such societies were founded for the propagation of ideas and principles, to which the French Revolution gave so vehement an impetus; in Ireland their sanguinary suppression helped to identify them with the sentiments of the nation at large, owing especially to the refusal of all reforms. In England they were identified only with the extreme wing of the Liberal party, and their

memory subsided as the vista of reform opened. But in England, from the beginning of the century, there have been more desperate political attempts, and more social outrages by far than in Ireland—if they are forgotten in England and heard of in Ireland, it is because the reforms required were granted in the former country and have been dragging slowly as regards the latter. England in 1812, in 1816, and in 1819, was convulsed by the terrorism and violence of the Luddites, the Spencean, and other conspiracies, and by the collisions of yeomanry, soldiery, and people at “Peterloo,” and elsewhere. The Invincibles of a recent date had their counterpart in the Cato Street conspirators, who even surpassed them in the diabolical nature of their plans, as they had plotted the murder of all the Ministers and the conflagration of London. The cause alleged by Thistlewood for his conspiracy, namely, the “Massacre at Manchester,” was similar to that alleged by the Dublin plotters. Then, the north of England and Scotland were in the throes of an abortive insurrection in 1820. There was a constant ferment, in reference to Queen Caroline, culminating in 1821 by the fight at her funeral.

SEDITION AND OUTRAGE GENERAL : A "NO-TAX"
MOVEMENT.

In 1829, from Spitalfields to Yorkshire, there was a rising of the operatives, injured by the introduction of power-looms and other causes, of a most riotous character, resulting in great loss of property. The Paris revolution of 1830 reacted strongly on England, and incendiary fires reddened the clouds of night over the southern shires; in London, placards were issued, headed: "To arms, Liberty or Death." The intimidation was so great that King William IV. could not proceed to the Lord Mayor's banquet, and the Funds fell rapidly. In Bristol, in 1831, the people, furious for reform, broke open the gaols and set loose the prisoners, gutted the Mansion House, Bishop's Palace, Custom House—all the public and many private buildings—which they set on fire, destroying property to the amount of half a million sterling. In 1832 Lord Milton forbade the tax-gatherer to call; placards ordered a general no-tax movement; the political unions ostentatiously asserted the constitutional right of Englishmen to bear arms, and prepared for an insurrection. The king and queen were hissed and howled at, whilst their carriage was pelted with mud. In three days nearly two millions sterling were with-

drawn from the Bank of England, owing to a political run upon the banks. The troops occupied themselves on Sundays, after worship, by grinding their swords, and they were kept ready to sally forth at a moment's notice.

SECRET SOCIETIES, INTIMIDATION, AND MURDER.

In 1834 the Trades Unions were authoritatively charged with being secret societies, extensively ramified, and carrying out their aims by despotic intimidation, frequent outrage, and secret assassination. In 1836 it was found that the Orange Society had entered into a conspiracy to prevent the accession of the Princess Victoria, and to place their Grand Master the Duke of Cumberland on the throne, and that the army had been tampered with. Mr. Hume and Lord John Russell took action in the House of Commons. In 1837 the great Glasgow strike, accompanied by burnings, outrage, and murder, was followed by the arrest of the secret committee; it was given in evidence that so common was crime, that when nothing occurred the question was: "Why was no one murdered by the committee last night?" The unionist organisation persisted widespread in England. Then, in 1838, with "the Canterbury riots" came the great Chartist movement, gradually swelling in importance, gathering arms, and finally sacking Birmingham, besieging New-

port, threatening Westminster, and breaking in various collisions. Occasional bread-riots interspersed the early part of the century also.

ASSASSINATION OF THE PREMIER'S SECRETARY,
THE ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE ARRAIGNED,
AND COBDEN ACCUSED.

Then came the Anti-Corn-Law League, accompanied by Anti-Corn-Law riots. In 1843 Mr. Drummond, the Premier's private secretary, was shot, at Charing Cross, by a Scottish fanatic who mistook him for Sir Robert Peel, his chief. Lord Brougham charged the crime on the oratory of the League—some of it the language of clergymen in that very metropolis, language which he abhorred and detested, as “being calculated to produce fatal effects.” Cobden protested in the House against the attempted identification, but having declared he should hold Sir Robert Peel responsible for the state of the country, the minister challenged the statement as pointing him out for assassination; Cobden in vain objected, the Ministerial party howled him down, and the *Times* declared him an accomplice in the doctrine of assassination. After a somewhat extensive series of rick-burnings, the last great change—contested by a strong resistance—was granted.

LIKE CAUSES, LIKE EFFECTS, IN IRELAND.

The troubles in Ireland have, at their worst, been few and far between, compared with those noted on this record. Strong resistance to strongly-desired popular measures have invariably been accompanied by riots, combinations, conspiracies, and even by assassinations in England. As regards Ireland, all that can be said is that similar causes have produced similar effects, but neither so generally nor so often. The eyes of short-sighted observers have been dazzled by passing through a phase of social tumult, through which England has many times passed, and forgotten them. So also in a short space this will be forgotten in Ireland. Punish the crime, but eradicate the cause, and the reign of peace is restored.

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES BEGIN IN THE ENGLISH PALE.

In both countries the acts of violence have been of two kinds, political and social. The latter, in England, have chiefly been connected with commercial or trade causes, though of old there had been agrarian tumults also. But in England the landlords and their tenants lived together, generation after generation, as old neighbours, and the children of neighbours

bound together by many kindly ties. When difficulties did arise the ever-growing demands of the manufacturing towns and mines drew off the agricultural population, and so prevented collisions. In Ireland the agrarian question eclipsed all others, and has always been essentially agrarian, irrespective of race or creed. It was an Anglo-Norman Catholic Archbishop, Henry de Loundres, who (A.D. 1213) had the distinction of stirring the first agrarian outrage. Summoning the tenants and farmers of the see to show the evidences of their tenures, he suddenly flung the documents into a blazing fire. And it was his Anglo-Norman Catholic flock who in a furious rage assailed him as a scorch-villein, and when he had made his escape, irreverently beat his Chaplains, Registers, and Summoners. The freeholders of the pale were so sorely pressed upon that some fled for refuge to the "Irish enemy." On the other hand, "poore distressed people of the Irish" sought shelter with the Norman lords, their foes, who derived greater returns from their labours. Sir Phelim O'Neill, like many others in 1641, was found to have turned his Irish tenants out of their lands, even to starve upon the mountains, whilst they took on more profitable English tenants.

IRISH PEASANTS PEACEFUL, CIVIL, AND
INDUSTRIOUS.

There is, in fact, but one testimony borne throughout history to the peacefulness and placability of the Irish peasant: "The churle of Irelande," observes an old writer, "is a very simple and toylesome man, desiring nothing but that he may not be eaten oute with ceasse, coyne, nor liverie." So in the report sent to an English company, who undertook to plant with English settlers a portion of Munster, on the forfeiture of the Earl of Desmond's estates, Robert Paine writes, in 1589, that the country had been slandered by idle and disappointed English adventurers, who could get nothing save by honest work, of which they were altogether ignorant. The natives "are very civill and honestly given," greatly inclined to husbandry, most hospitable. "They keepe their promise faithfully," he adds, "and are more desirous of peace than our English men, for that in time of warres they are more chardged." "They have a common saying, which, I am persuaded, they speake unfeinedly, which is, *Defend me and spend me*, meaning from the worser sorte of our countrymen." "They are obedient to the laws," he continues, "so you may travell through all the land without any danger or injurie offered of the verye worst Irish, and be greatly releevd of

the best." Sir John Davies, Attorney-General under James I., declared that no man loved equal and indifferent justice so much as the Irishman. The chain of testimony can be easily carried out, every successive English writer reiterating the same truth. Now, since such was the character of the Irish peasant, if that character has deteriorated, the blame must fall not on nature or hereditary instinct, but upon the circumstances of his case. Wave after wave of new invaders came upon him. When the lapse of a little time and the influence of neighbourhood had made one set of landlords and their tenants friends, a new invasion came to root out the landlords and rob the husbandmen. They were kept strangers, and made foes, to the bitter loss of both. This arose, in former days, from the policy which gave Ireland over to be the plunder ground of the victors in English royal or revolutionary wars.

THE WAR OF CHICANE: IRELAND A PERPETUAL PLUNDER GROUND.

Nor were the swordsmen allowed security of possession, for any considerable time, even if nothing could be alleged against their conduct by the newcomers. "The War of Chicane," said Burke most aptly, "followed the War of the Sword;" and of the twain it was by far the worse. Men ran stronger on

the scent for spoil than for blood. Sir John Davis, who bore such testimony to the Irish character, and who sharply rebuked Fitz-Thomas of Desmond and the like, for having by exactions accumulated large fortunes, caused himself a vast social revolution, with the object of gathering spoil. In the Irish as in all ancient systems, the land belonged to the community, not to the chieftains. If the chieftain were declared a traitor, what service was it to his prosecutors? He might be hanged and his personal property seized, but no real estate belonged to him. The law of England did not serve, for it recognised the custom of Kent, where the maxim protected the land: "The father to the bough, the son to the plough." The Law of the Sword would have left it so, and the law of England would have sanctioned it, and given peace. But the spirit of Chicane, seeing that lands held in gavel-kind were privileged against escheats, set to work to disgavel the country and overthrow its long-settled customs. Then came hordes of pettifogging persecutors, eager for prey and plunder. Charges of treason were mines of Golconda, for the prosecutors are found continually stepping from poverty into the possession of thousands of acres. It was discovered that no Irishman could be loyal who lived on fertile soil. On mountains, moors, and morasses, Irish loyalty might exist: not in

fruitful valleys. This was a chief cause of the Great Rebellion of 1641. Captain Audley Mervyn, in the Irish Upper House, declared in 1640, "These words: '*nullus liber homo ejicitur e libero suo tenemento in præjudicium parium*,' live in the Rolls, but they are dead, where property and freehold are determined (*i.e.*, ended) by paper petitions."

AGRARIANISM IN ULSTER AND MUNSTER.

The Protestant inhabitants of Antrim, Down, and Tyrone, complained that their just titles were disregarded and trodden on by the "prelates and their faction," who laid hold of the best lands as glebes. And the insurgents of Longford, addressing the Viceroy, denounced the "avoidance of grants of Land and Liberties by the Quirks and Quiddities of the Law." A score of years later the Cromwellian tenants conspired in the "Phanatic Plot," against what one of them called the "unjust conduct of the Court of Claims in turning poor Englishmen out of their lands." In the last century "Oakboys" and "Hearts of Steel" amongst the Scotch and English settlements in true Ulster were as noted and as violent as the "Whiteboys" in Munster. There is no more distinct lesson taught by history than that the agrarian question has its roots in other causes than in peculiarities of race or religion.

PART II.

THE DEAD PAST : THE NEW NATIONS.

Ancient England and Ancient Ireland are with the past. With that past, likewise, are many evils which troubled their relations, made them enemies, or kept them foes. The principle of exclusivism has almost perished. Arising out of conquest, it began when early invaders drew a barrier between themselves and those who had preceded them. The Milesians, whose name in later days was synonymous with Hibernians, were once an aristocracy of the sword as detested as any by the outer natives. Their pale was broken down by the Norse, theirs by the Normans, theirs by the democratic Cromwellians; successive barriers were shattered by successive invasions, and the foes of the past have been fused together. Finally the last persisting pales between sections of the people have been obliterated by Civilisation, the omnipresent invader. The influence of the progress of science in preparing the ways of peace has not always been recognised. Yet nothing is more evident than that political economy, by eradicating the principles of exclusivism in trade and manufactures, has removed one of the greatest obstacles to a cordial connexion

between Ireland and England. It has, indeed, been occasionally invoked as antagonistic to agrarian reforms in Ireland, yet its most potent preacher, John Stuart Mill, advocated those reforms with the utmost distinctness, and they came after him haltingly. The thorough settlement of the land question, for which all minds are now open, whilst doing justice to both the contending parties, should settle finally the last troublesome straggler of the War of Chicane, and leave the nation to the pursuit of improved husbandry and the industrial arts. Add to this the equalisation of educational endowments dictated by the plain principles of justice and most readily accomplished, without hurt to any, by levelling upward, and then the last remnant of the penal policy shall have disappeared.

A NEW ERA : MODERN ENGLAND AND MODERN IRELAND.

These things accomplished we begin a New Era. Face to face stand a Modern England and a Modern Ireland. What shall be their future course? Shall they proceed, bearing with them the memory of past evils, always rankling and envenoming every discussion? or would it not be a matter of the wisest statesmanship to cut these memories clean away from living effect by reorganising the

relations of the two countries, in such a manner as to make the coming epoch—an epoch of contentment and of peace?

REORGANISATION REQUIRED.

It is obvious to all that some reorganisation is required, for those who most oppose the popular Irish demand have suggested several profound modifications, varying from the abolition of the Viceroyalty to the revivification of Cromwell. It must be generally confessed that the present system does not work with rapidity or ease, smoothness or safety. The massiveness of the machinery is such, and the friction so great, that to move it requires an enormous effort; the reiterated result being that the useful fire of progress becomes periodically fanned into a dangerous conflagration. Then, at length, the machinery moves, and the object is achieved, in part;—other disproportionate efforts must follow for even small amendments. In Irish politics, to shake down an apple it needs an earthquake. When the earthquake comes more than the apple must fall. Such a system, involving long delays and evoking great irritation, cannot be regarded as perfect, and needing no repair to suit it to the requirements of the time. Postponement of measures, the justice of which has long been admitted, as was the case with many, does not produce the same effect

when those measures are international as when they are domestic. If, for instance, it be an English project of reform, one of two great English parties bears the blame of opposing it; but, though denounced as wrong in opposing, that party is regarded as still English, and as having, with all its perverseness, the national welfare at heart. On the other hand, when an analogous measure for Ireland is thrown out by a parliamentary majority, it is not so much that majority, nor a political party which receives the blame, but the Parliament itself—the “English Parliament.” Under the present system, what would otherwise be a party question is transformed into a national question, and an act of party antagonism becomes viewed as an evidence of anti-Irish hatred. It is difficult for Englishmen, and especially for those who labour in the ranks of progress, to realise how completely this rule prevails. All the animosities of the past are thus revived—every repulse calling up all those of the past as by a mnemonic system—otherwise they should have perished out of memory. Not less injurious to Ireland herself is the effect of such prolonged delays. They develop feuds which, with every passing month, become more fierce and bitter. The consequence is that germs of reform develop into class wars or internecine strifes, too often issuing in violence.

MODERATION OBSTRUCTED : GREATER
CONCESSIONS EXACTED.

Not only is this the case, but another result follows—never anticipated and usually overlooked—and this is that a moderate concession, which at the beginning would have been welcomed, is rejected with contempt before the struggle ends.

The Irish Parliament, for instance, long besought simple freedom to export and to import; the opposition to that measure resulted in the concession of legislative independence.

The Bishops offered in the Catholic petition of 1808 the privilege of veto to the Crown; George III. would not so much as hear of the Catholic question—the consequence was complete emancipation.

A modification of the tithe-system fifty-five years ago would have been acclaimed. That system was enforced with the bayonet; the immediate result was the abolition of a number of prelates, and the ultimate consequence the Disestablishment of the Church.

The Land Question presents the most emphatic because the most recent lesson of any. Twenty years ago, and later still, the meek proposals for a settlement, made by Ulster members and others, were rejected with a scoff. "Tenant-right," Lord Palmerston

had said, "means landlord's wrong." What followed? Concessions which would have filled the hearts of the original advocates with gratitude and delight have barely been tolerated, until greater should be gained. And wherefore? Because so vast and so prolonged an effort had been needed that the result was no longer commensurate with the force engendered. It cannot be doubted that if the machinery had been less complicated, and the early moderate reforms had passed, the landlords would have been in an easier position. Even three years ago, they could have made better terms than now. As a consequence, the Government may have to step in and rescue them from a most unhappy position, by an advance of money, as when a million was advanced on the tithes. The refusal and delay of moderate land-law reforms threaten, therefore, to result in a disestablishment of landlordism. It may be possible to avert it still, but for how long could it be averted under a system where the land-classes are pitted against each other, with no inducement to make peace?

CONTRADICTORY POLICIES : GOVERNMENT BY CONVULSION.

Considered generally, the disaccord between England and Ireland, and the troubles of the latter country, have their origin in the per-

petual antagonism of two principles. One is the principle of well-ordered liberty, the very essence of the Constitution, which is based on the intelligent will of the majority of the community. The other is the principle of government by conquest, if principle it can be called. Neither race nor creed bounds or affects one principle or the other. Being mutually hostile, they cannot co-exist, without continual collisions, in which now one, now the other wins the upper hand. Conquest policy is strong only so long as it is upheld by the sword of the soldiery or the bayonet of the police, and consequently lives by coercion. That, however, is but a factitious vitality, possible in time of warfare; whereas the Constitutional principle, perpetually generated in the masses, perpetually presses onward to success. After a struggle, more or less prolonged, against a temperate demand for reform, conquest policy must at length, though fighting to the last, give way abruptly to a greater force, and an increased demand,—hence, we have progress marked by a series of successive shocks, which cannot be dignified as a state polity, but may be termed Government by Convulsion.

If England had possessed a despotic form of government, the continuance of a conquest policy in Ireland would have been much less difficult. But, as the spirit of freedom breathes throughout her institutions, and as the atmo-

sphere of liberty is pervasive, the very existence of the Constitution in England is an instigation to disaffection in any connected country, ruled on repressive principles. The Constitution, then, is the great conspirator. Conquest policy may assume different disguises at times ; be professedly an effort to protect pure Catholicity, as in the days of Henry II., or to protect pure Protestantism, as in the reigns of William and Anne, or generally to foster the colonial garrison against the people at large ; yet the disguise is transparent when the Catholic purifiers are seen driving out a virtuous priesthood from their edifices, and the Protestant protectors compelling 20,000 industrious Protestant operatives to fly to Catholic France, and the colony's fosterers smiting down the colony's trade and commerce by reiterated laws.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE.

The spirit of Constitutional liberty has been the one potent and ultimately victorious foe of this conquest policy, whatever its disguise, how Protean soever its forms. And this is demonstrable from the fact that not only Irishmen but Englishmen have been active against it : nay, a generation or two generations before any great Irish reform has been secured English thinkers have been found advocating and urging it. On the Land Question, for

instance, the works of Thornton, Kay, and Stuart Mill—to name no others—have been the leading guides. When the latter pictures what would have happened had Hoche succeeded in landing in Ireland, how, on the flight of the great landowners, the tenants would have been made owners of their farms, “subject to some fixed payment to the State”—when he adds: “What Hoche would have done for the Irish peasant, or its equivalent, has still to be done; and any Government which does not do it, does not fulfil the rational or moral conditions of a Government,” he supplied arguments to reformers in Ireland, which, re-echoing from an Irish platform, seem seditious and revolutionary. Even his observation that, “There is no necessity that it should be done as Hoche would most likely have done it, without indemnity to the losers,” would have been denounced as not so much a qualification as a cynical suggestion. Ulysses recognised Telemachus on his arrival in Ithaca, but the British mind does not always recognise its offspring when they return from Ireland, but names them “Irish ideas.” Conquest policy and its adherents reject them as rabid rebels, whom to admit is to sanction the overthrow of all things sacred. A long and bitter strife ensues, after which they take their place as legitimate citizens, and a succeeding generation wonders at the policy of its predecessors, and repeats the process.

CONDITIONS OF CONQUEST POLICY : GALLICISING
GOVERNMENT.

To ensure the triumph of this policy, the only method which offers any possibilities of success would be to abolish freedom of the press in England, for a strict censorship over Irish ports would not suffice. Ideas would be smuggled if books and papers were kept out. There would remain the necessity of eradicating principles, natural to the human heart even in Ireland, nurtured by the Magna Charta of that country, and fomented by the example of other nations. A war against some ideas may be a duty ; but a war against such ideas by a country, whose life they are, against another which desires to live by them, cannot continue ; yet its unwisdom is apparently not self-evident. In order to maintain it, the old British constitutional practices of government have been largely departed from in Ireland,—constables under local authority have been replaced by a centralised *gensdarmierie*, unpaid justices to some extent by stipendiaries, even prefects and a suspect-law have been tried. In fact, the governmental system has been considerably Gallicised in Ireland. This is peculiarly unfortunate as bringing all the responsibility upon the central authority. When the Home Secretary, in England, interferes, it is to amend any error or excess

on the part of local authorities, and the public sentiment moves with him. In Ireland, owing to the difference of system, an intemperate or indiscreet act on the part of a remote subordinate will reflect its odium on the Castle, or perhaps be attributed to direct instigation, though the authorities there may experience an annoyance or disgust they cannot publicly express. That the abolition of the Viceroyalty was advocated by a subordinate whose conduct was most unpopular, would not conflict with this view, but tend to support it; and few arguments could be advanced more calculated to render the office popular, if it were otherwise, than the discontent of its control, exhibited by such officials. The only act, indicative of violence, done in disrespect of a Viceroy happened in 1824, when an "ascendency" riot arose in the theatre and a bottle was flung into the Viceregal box, on the Marquess of Wellesley's first visit. This, however, was an attestation of his popularity with the people at large. The existence of the Viceregal office is, in fact, regarded with favour in the country as a recognition of Irish nationality; whatever unpopularity may at times have attached to it, arose from the fact that an unpopular policy, originated elsewhere, should be enforced through its machinery. Whenever the policy was popular, the office was popular. Adopt the English system, render the policy representative of the just wish

of the majority, and the Castle at once occupies in Ireland the same position as the Home Office in England. Abolish the Castle, without change of policy, and all the odium of which it bore the brunt will fall upon the English central office. Abolition, even with a change of policy, means more of that centralisation, of which Ireland already complains.

REMEDIES: THE FALSE AND THE TRUE.

A frank abandonment of the antiquated conquest policy, largely given up already, would get rid of the very cause of constant collision and frequent convulsion. But what does this involve? In 1844 Mr. Disraeli, in a memorable passage, observed that gentlemen reading of a country placed as Ireland was, with "a starving population, an absentee aristocracy, and an alien Church, and, in addition, the weakest executive in the world," would say, "the remedy is revolution." But England, he said, stood in the way of a revolution, and therefore was the cause of all Ireland's misery. Hence it was the duty of an English Minister "to effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force." In 1868, Stuart Mill wrote that the Government should do for the Irish peasant what Hoche would have done. In both cases, I would point out, *results* are offered, not the

means of obtaining results. Now this course is one which would undoubtedly produce sweeping changes, far more rapid and radical if adopted when advised, than obtainable otherwise than by successful force. But rapid and revolutionary changes are not the most satisfactory modes of amelioration, were it only that they unsettle the mind and make it discontented with moderate future progress. A poor man falling in for a fortune is not seldom ruined by it; whilst one who raises himself by progressive earnings has his powers developed, his energies trained, and his mind disciplined in the economic virtues. For analogous reasons it is infinitely better that a country, instead of obtaining results by a sudden revolution, whether effected by force or by law, *ab extrâ*, should gradually work them out, and in so doing develop those qualities which are associated with gradual progress, including moderation, self-reliance, perseverance, and the civic virtues generally.

A PROVIDENTIAL PEACE-MAKER.

Twenty years ago exactly, Mr. Gladstone enunciated a principle and a policy for the development and success of which it cannot be presumptuous to suppose that Providence has specially spared him, so profound the fount of evils they would close, so fair the prospect they open of cordial peace between

two long discordant countries. "We are," he said, "a United Kingdom, made up of three nations, welded politically into one, but necessarily and in fact with many distinctions of law, of usage, of character, of history, and of religion. In circumstances such as these there are common questions, which must be administered upon principles common to the whole empire—all those questions in which the interests of the whole overbear and swallow up the interests of the parts. . . . But there are many other questions with regard to which in England, Scotland, and Ireland, that interest which is especially English, Scotch, or Irish predominates over that which is common; and with regard to the questions falling within that category, we ought to apply to Ireland the same principles on which we act in the other two countries, and legislate for them according to the views of the majority of the people of that country."

EPOCH-MAKING STATESMANSHIP.

These words, coming from the greatest statesman of Britain, are epoch-making. They intimate a final repudiation and complete reversal of that conquest policy which under various forms persistently maintained that the Irish should be regarded and treated as aliens and enemies in Ireland. That policy

dictated the rejection of the petition of the Irish chieftains for admission to the benefits of English law. It was the cause, as Spencer explains, of multiple oppressions and agrarian troubles, inasmuch as "the law of England was not ever properly applied to the Irish nation, as by a purposed plot of Government, but as they could insinuate and steal themselves under the same." So complete a foreigner and foe in Ireland was the Irishman, according to the spirit of that policy, that unless he sought and obtained a "patent of denization," he could hold no property safe, nor have any legal resource against open and avowed robbery. Without such a patent, "it was often," as wrote Sir John Davies, "adjudged no felony to kill him in time of peace." It was the breathing of that spirit over the land which, by stimulating the fraudulent confiscations, rendered all property insecure; it was its voice which, through the penal code, declared, only a generation since, that a Catholic was not supposed by law so much as to exist in a nation the vast majority of which was Catholic. A few years ago its words were still heard in exultation over the extermination and exodus of the Irish peasantry. With strange blindness or reckless improvidence it saw not or cared not that every intolerant act created a growth of grave troubles at home; and abroad gave heart, hope, and hatred, with battalions of the best

of soldiers, to the enemies of England. When the Irish community, as a whole, was proscribed as by the last penal code, representatives of all its classes were welcomed by the great Continental powers, guided in their councils, headed their armies or fought in the ranks. When only a class was specially affected by it, as was the case with the tenantry, that class gave to America, in the Protestant emigrants chiefly at first, and in the Catholics chiefly afterwards, the very core of its most hostile and warlike forces at the Revolution, and at every occasion since, when British policy was to be thwarted. The conquest policy may therefore lay claim to the singular distinction of having been the efficient cause of dividing these countries by a barrier of hatred at home and of surrounding them by a circle of foes abroad. So long as it was continued, the integrity of the Empire might exist on paper, but as a fiction—not a fact: for the existence of a conquest policy, as between connected elements of a State, means, and of its very essence must mean, a policy of disintegration and danger to the Empire.

In direct opposition stands the principle enunciated by Mr. Gladstone, which may be correctly called the principle of Constitutional policy. For it is not merely postulated that the results of a Constitution are to be extended to Ireland, but the Constitution itself in its principles and practice.

AN ERA OF RECONSTRUCTION.

The majority of Irishmen are no longer to be regarded, explicitly or impliedly, as aliens "denizenized" or "not denizenized," but as free-born citizens with rights to self-rule analogous to those possessed by the free born citizens of England, under a common and supreme control. The obstacles which the Conquest policy built up, having been more or less completely removed during the period of government by Convulsion, now comes an era of Reconstruction. How the details of the measure, and its administrative machinery, are to be shaped can present no great difficulties, though it must involve mutual concessions. It was natural that, in the generation which followed the Union, the restoration of the *status quo ante* should have been the one desire. That policy commends itself to what may be termed Conservative patriotism, the chief of which, Sir G. Gavan Duffy, eminent in home and colonial politics, affirms his opinion clearly in his recent statesmanlike works. Lord Russell (though the fact is universally overlooked) proposed after the Fenian frays, the formation of four provincial Parliaments, a fancy which has been latterly revived. Isaac Butt, at the head of a movement originated by Irish Conservatives after the disestablishment of the Church, made a strenuous plea for Federalism. The

idea had been entertained by several distinguished men, including Lord O'Hagan, in former years, and even O'Connell inclined to it, at a memorable moment, when it was thought the Government might make a compromise. Mr. O'Connor and others prefer the colonial system. Mr. Parnell has declared himself for "Grattan's parliament," but (though some frivolous criticism has been offered on this) it is obvious that his allegiance is given to the principle, not to details,—to the existence of an organism having the functions and faculties of a true legislative body, as contra-distinguished from minor proposals. With the characteristic sagacity of a statesman, by not entering into a discussion of details he has left himself at liberty to consider, in the approaching deliberations, how the machinery of home-government may best be adapted to the circumstances of the country, the progress of civilisation, and the cohesion of the empire.

ONE THING ESSENTIAL.

Whatever be the form ultimately evolved, one thing at least is essential, and this is that the Irish capital shall be made a legislative centre. This extrudes Lord Russell's plan of four provincial diets, which has no constitutional precedent; and which, proceeding on the false principle of offering measures not kindred to the country, nor asked for, nor

liked by its inhabitants, would issue in dissatisfaction and in results the reverse of those intended. It would be revolutionary, and not conservative. The attraction of a metropolitan legislature, on the contrary, would secure the presence of representatives of higher mental culture, a loftier tone of thought, greater dignity of debate, and more moderation in action. The commixture of men of all creeds and classes would result, as it has everywhere resulted, in a respectful recognition of the rights of each and the duties of all. The interests of the common welfare dwarfing pettier desires would put to shame sectional and sectarian sentiments. All these conditions would be seriously, many of them would be mortally, jeopardised in the operation of provincial corporations, whose decrees would have neither dignity in origin nor authority in action.

It has been alleged that the existence of an Irish legislative assembly would detract from and diminish the supreme central authority. Facts, however, bear testimony to the contrary. Communities which possess similar systems of government do not complain of this defect; the attraction in all such cases, being in fact centripetal, tends rather to augment the central authority. The only case cited to the contrary, that of the Southern States, is cited in ignorance of the fact that they based their claim to secede on the allegation that they had joined

the Federation as sovereign states, and retained their rights to withdraw when a fundamental institution was endangered. They made their appeal to the sword, and have accepted the decision. Other communities have not had such difficulties, nor would the States have been so troubled, had not slavery existed in one section after it had been expunged from the other. Besides, it must be remembered that the immemorial complaint has been, and is, that the Royal Writ does not run in Ireland, that the laws have not the sympathy and support of its people, that perennial passive resistance merges periodically into active hostility against the Central Government. It is this condition of things which will be detracted from and diminished, by the formation of a local legislative centre in the country itself.

THE CENTRE OF ATTRACTION: AT HOME OR ABROAD?

Yet another very important consideration must likewise be borne in mind, and this is: that whilst the sympathy of the Irish masses was never given to Westminster, it has been given in other directions. Having in 1868 pointed out that, even should Disestablishment and Land Reform be effected, absenteeism and other troubles would follow, only to be obviated by developing the national institu-

tions of the country, I indicated this important factor in the following words: "Wanting a social heart, or centre of attraction, the Irish have been attracted to Spain, to France, and to America. The want at present exists; it would still continue, if Irish feeling be disregarded, after the reform of the land-system and disestablishment of the Church. If not satisfied, New York may yet be, as it tends to become, the political Metropolis of the Irish People. When, however, the action of centrifugal forces is arrested, particles cohere which would otherwise fly asunder. In the same way, when repellent forces, such as a hostile establishment and an unjust land-system are made to cease, the estrangement and repulsion they cause ceases with them. A simple removal of separating agencies allows the natural action of attracting influences, previously overmastered, to be observed and to develop."¹

A "UNION OF HEARTS."

In fact, no sooner is the Conquest policy repudiated, and the Constitutional principle advanced, than repulsion is replaced by attraction, and patriotic Irishmen begin to consider how best to strengthen the bond which, with that "union of hearts" Grattan spoke of,

¹ *Modern Ireland: its Vital Questions, Secret Societies, and Government.* London: Longmans.

should bind securely and closely together two friendly countries. For they believe with him that "connexion is a wise and a profound policy," and they are all the more deeply convinced of it, because they have experienced the truth of his prediction, that "connexion without an Irish parliament is connexion without its own principle, without analogy of condition, without the pride of honour which should attend it, is innovation, is peril, is subjugation — not connexion." And because they have realised that "without union of hearts — with a separate government, and without a separate parliament, identification is extinction, is dishonour, is conquest—not identification;" so likewise they will see, in the emphatic words of Grattan, that, with a local legislature and a union of hearts "identification is a solid and imperial maxim, necessary for the preservation of freedom, necessary for that of empire." Whatever might have been the case forty years ago, there would not, so far as my judgment goes, be any unwillingness to welcome a connexion strong as any federal union could establish, which, whilst giving Ireland a local legislature for local affairs would maintain an imperial union by means of an imperial parliament.¹

¹ This article was written before Mr. Gladstone's Bill appeared. Ireland has welcomed the principle of that splendid act of statesmanship, and its details cannot fail to be perfected by the master-hand of its author.

PHANTOM FEARS : PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENTS.

If an arrangement upon a federal basis should be adopted, it would have the advantage of putting an end to those fears or affected fears which now plead for guarantees and the protection of minorities. The fictitious fears are merely political artifices, which ought by this time to have grown too trite for service. Before every great act of justice they raised their pallid brows, and with uplifted hands and shaking heads they warned reformers to retreat, ere they set loose the hordes which would deluge the land with blood. Before the Relief Act of 1829, known as "Catholic Emancipation," before the Land Act of 1870, previous to Disestablishment, on the eve of the Ballot Act, shapes of horror were shown ready to ravage the land, which were gory ghosts¹ indeed compared with the conditional and diffident phantoms of the politer present. In the order of things, they must apparently present themselves like banshees, but their wail should be welcomed, for it always forebodes the extinction of an article of Conquest policy.

As for those gentlemen who profess to be moved by such chimerical fears, the unreality of their apprehensions is shown in their proposals. For their suggestion it is to grant a council or

¹ *History of the Land Tenures and Land Classes of Ireland*, pp. 280, 1 n. London : Longmans.

parliament to each province, which means to establish three parliaments almost entirely Catholic, and a fourth in which there would be nearly an equal division of creeds—and a majority of Nationalists. Hence by this exquisite plan of Protestant alarmists the arguments, vote, and influence of the northern Protestant members would be restricted within the limits of Ulster, and imperatively forbidden to affect the fortunes of their fellow-religionists in three-fourths of Ireland—that is to say in those three southern provinces where only the Protestants are so few as to be unable to take care of themselves ! Plainly, if the Irish Catholics had any dream of domination they would welcome such a proposition which, while delivering over three-fourths of Ireland into their hands, leaves them an equality of the population in the remaining fourth. The very fact that the Irish people at large have never proposed, and would scout such an arrangement, demonstrates that thoughts of creed-predominance have been and are remote from the minds of the Catholic majority.¹

¹ This reasoning applies with double force to the project of giving a separate council to the north-eastern Ulster counties, whilst the remainder of the country should be represented in Dublin. The petty parochial parliament of three or four counties would be completely eclipsed by the prestige of the metropolitan legislature, and Ulster Protestants prevented from

There are some who have genuine apprehensions. Now, of these one section is composed of those for whom there is a psychological excuse. Not every brain can stand the stress of social or political agitation and change without giving way in some direction, hence on all such occasions persons are observed who, rational on all other topics, have their minds more or less affected on one special subject. In the great turmoil preceding the Land Act of 1870 one landlord, after going armed *cap-à-pie* for a time, went out of his senses ; at a later day one of the minor agitators was caught addressing imaginary crowds at midnight. Many of the Communards went about quite insane on political points. Dickens, in one of his novels, paints a faithful portrait in Lord George Gordon, of one whose mania is coloured by religious feeling. A prevalent form is that of excessive distrust and suspicion conjoined with a belief in imaginary persecutions and fictitious persecutors—on the Continent these have been supposedly Jesuits, Freemasons, spies, secret societies—in Britain chiefly witches, or private foes, but on great occasions the Pope of Rome. Ireland is entitled to her share of mild maniacs, but they may be dismissed with the certainty that the disorder is a transient one.

taking a highly useful and welcome part in the National deliberations.

NO FANATICISM.

To those who do seriously and sanely look with some lurking apprehension to a possible growth of Catholic bigotry, intolerance or predominance, earnest reasoning is decidedly due. Therefore, it is proper to remind them, first, that Irishmen, as all conversant with the country and with its history must confess, are not by nature inclined to bigotry anywhere. Like the Athenians, when, in the pagan period, Christian evangelisers came, they received them with courtesy and curiosity; and, most assuredly, Christianity did not destroy their natural kindliness of heart. Their welcome to the Protestant fugitives from Queen Mary's rule ought to be remembered to them. Secondly, it should be recollected that Catholic Maryland, colonised largely with Irishmen under Lord Baltimore's grant, was the first and for years the only country, in Christendon, in which perfect religious equality was established.

Nor should men forget the fact of everyday observation, namely, that not only have Irish Catholic corporations chosen Protestant mayors, and Catholic constituencies Protestant representatives, but that at all times Protestants have been most popular as leaders in

political affairs. Thirdly, it may be laid down as a general principle that the people do not persecute for religion. Governments have sometimes persecuted with religion as a cover for a political cause, but not the people. With a silent, saturnine, or "dour" race, an exception may be found, but the idea is foreign to the feelings of a race gifted with exuberance of language, delighting in polemics, gregarious by instinct, and generally satisfied of its superiority in logic. The man who feels he has the best of an argument is the least likely to resort to force. Fourthly, persecution tends to make men bigots, not prosperity. Some Catholic ecclesiastics, perhaps unduly timid, have apprehended that with a free and prosperous people indifference would appear. It is, in fact, indifference and not fanaticism, which the future has to fear; the condition of the Continent proves it, but this is a peril which affects all religious bodies equally.

Finally, it must be borne in mind that—though a class or a creed-section may be welded together by persecution, and, having a common burthen, combine to get rid of the load—once the disability is removed, the questions that come up for consideration are questions of general politics upon which men's opinions are not shaped by their faith. According to family influence, education, age, or other circumstances, there will be (as there

are) Tories, Whigs, Radicals, and so forth, amongst Irish Catholic politicians. In an Irish parliament the Nationalist members will naturally subdivide into parties and "wings," as members normally divide in all parliaments. It is of the highest probability, in fact it may be taken as certain, that there will be a complete revolution of views, peacefully effected—one not at all anticipated—the agitating Southern Provinces will become Conservative in local affairs, and the Conservative North-East will become Radical. Rural and Catholic constituencies naturally tend to Conservatism; but intercourse with America will temper and liberalise the tendency. On the other hand, manufacturing districts containing masses of men more or less detached from the land, tend towards Liberalism, and even Radicalism, and this tendency will be promoted by the presence of many dissenters. In moving politically in this direction, Belfast will simply revert to her former position as the most democratic of the Irish districts.¹ The consequence will be that Belfast democratic candidates will be called to organise and represent constituencies in the South, where the rural proletariat has a question to press forward; whilst some of the Northern Conservative members will be

¹ Belfast was the most liberal town in Ireland, during the existence of the Irish Parliament, and greatly promoted the emancipation of the Catholics.

the chosen representatives of districts where, living on great farms, and deriving no further change, Catholic graziers control the vote.

IRELAND'S FUTURE.

It must not be overlooked that, with a local legislature, the more intense the feeling of Nationality becomes the more closely it will draw together all sects and classes of the community. It would be a point of honour with every patriot to prove that minorities were more considered and better treated by their fellow-countrymen than they had been or would be under different circumstances. Ireland would be on her trial and on her mettle. The memory of ancient kindness, sometimes obscured now by transient clouds, would shine forth. The examples of those Protestants who, at home and abroad, steadfastly championed at every juncture the liberation of the Catholic masses would be recalled and glorified. The conservative principles of society would be vivified and set in action. Law, being the voice of the people, would have the whole strength of the people to render it searching and effective. Outrage, developed under abnormal conditions, would be rooted out with ruthless hand, like a fetid fungus from a drained morass.

Nor would it be one of the least benefits resulting, that questions of social progress would occupy energies and minds hitherto drawn necessarily but overmuch into politics. If Ireland was changed from being a land of arts and learning into a land of politics, the change was not of her own seeking, but was forced upon her. Only when learning was banned, and manufactures were crippled, did the land, the only resource of the people, become an ever-increasing cause of contention. Let those revive, and with other sources of prosperity supplied, the land-classes will jar no more. The constant desire of the nation, manifested generation after generation, has been to resume the cultivation of those studies, the prosecution of those arts, industries, and sciences, for which there has ever existed an aptitude, an instinct, nay, a passion, in the Irish mind. It is a remarkable fact that, though gifted with courage, fond of a soldier's life, and ready to march to death "with military glee," as Scott noted, the Irish, as a nation, have always cherished another ideal than military glory—an ideal of intellectual, artistic, and industrial pre-eminence, which is one, surely, that beyond all others a far-seeing and philosophic statesman should desire to foster and encourage. They may err on their way to the achievement of that ideal, but they will learn by their errors, and with the grave chastening imposed upon minds by the

responsibility of power they will eliminate exaggerated fancies, and realising for the first time the difficulties of government, they will give sympathy where they gave defiance, and be glad to march moderately onward, helping and helped by the neighbour nation—Modern England and Modern Ireland hand-in-hand.

“ No cloud
Of anger shall remain, but peace assured
And reconcilement.”

Taught by experience, let not this final reform be long deferred, lest the canker of irritation again set in and embitter all. Now is the auspicious time when we still have, as peace-maker between the nations, one who is revered by both, and who, with the experienced wisdom of ULYSSES, combines that unwonted power which alone can bend the bow of ACHILLES that otherwise may lie—as it has lain—for generations unstrung.

GEORGE SIGERSON.

HISTORICAL FACTS AND FIGURES RESPECTING IRELAND, by W. LEIGH BERNARD, Barrister-at-Law, Fellow of the Statistical Society of London.

THE great question for Great Britain at present being "Home Rule for Ireland," it seems to be a fitting season to remind electors of a few historical facts and figures respecting that much misunderstood part of the dominions of Her Britannic Majesty. The history of Ireland being so very little known to the British public, save so far as the same has been incorporated with English history, it can scarcely be wondered that its people are so frequently misrepresented, by those who have not had an opportunity of understanding the reasons why true Irish hearts still cling to the memories and ancient glories of their beloved country. In fact, the most erroneous notions have been formed even by Ireland's own sons and daughters about their own country, owing to their ignorance of her history, in consequence of the way the history of Ireland has been purposely omitted from the subjects taught in schools.

Without going into the vexed controversial question as to how Christianity was first introduced into Ireland, and what was the peculiar faith of the early inhabitants, there is no doubt that at the time of the Reformation in the

reign of King Henry VIII. the majority of the population were Roman Catholics.

POPULATION.

The earliest records of the number of the population are given in *Thom's Almanac of the United Kingdom*, as follows:—

Date.	Authority.	Population.
1672.	Sir William Petty	1,320,000
1695.	Treasurer of Royal Society, London	1,034,102
1712.	Thomas Dobbs, Esq.	2,099,094
1754.	Hearth Money Collectors	2,372,634
1788.	Do. Do.	2,845,932
1791.	Do. Do.	4,088,226

The population at the time the Act of Union was passed in 1800¹ has been estimated at 5,300,000, and the Census Commissioners have subsequently ascertained the following figures:—

In 1821	6,801,827
„ 1831	7,767,401
„ 1841	8,196,597
„ 1851	6,574,278
„ 1861	5,798,967
„ 1871	5,412,377
„ 1881	5,174,836

¹ The population of England and Wales, which in 1884 was estimated at 27,162,449, was but 8,892,536 in 1801, when the Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland came into operation.

The population has since 1881 decreased, owing to emigration, and has been estimated to be 4,901,241 on the 31st December, 1885. The emigration returns show that upwards of 3,000,000 persons emigrated from Ireland between 1st May, 1851, and 31st December, 1885.

RELIGION.

The first religious census of the people was taken in 1861, and the population of each province included the following Roman Catholics in that year, and in 1871 and 1881 respectively :—

Year.	Leinster.	Munster.	Ulster.	Connaught.	Total Roman Catholics.
1861	1,252,553	1,420,076	966,618	866,023	4,505,265
1871	1,145,104	1,304,684	897,230	803,849	4,150,867
1881	1,094,825	1,249,384	833,566	783,116	3,960,891

The percentage of Roman Catholic population was as follows :—

In 1861	77·7
„ 1871	76·7
„ 1881	76·5

The following table shows, by counties, the religious profession of the inhabitants according to the Census of 1881, and the percentage of Roman Catholic population :—

PROVINCES AND COUNTIES.	Roman Catholics.	Protestant Episcopalians.	Presbyterians.	Methodists.	All other Persuasions.	Information refused.	Total Population.	Percentage of R. Catholics.
Province of LEINSTER.								
Carlow	41,223	5,048	31	129	86	1	46,568	88.5
Dublin	820,515	80,847	7,812	3,734	5,884	117	418,910	76.5
Kildare	65,935	8,503	770	302	202	2	75,804	87.0
Kilkenny	94,149	4,956	206	142	76	1	90,531	94.6
King's	60,040	6,883	290	436	213	...	72,862	89.3
Longford	55,501	4,887	308	189	32	2	61,009	91.0
Louth	71,179	5,170	1,005	250	80	...	77,684	91.7
Meath	81,743	5,363	523	65	44	1	87,469	93.5
Queen's	64,315	7,899	200	399	192	29	73,124	88.0
Westmeath	66,201	4,971	319	195	111	1	71,798	92.2
Wexford	112,794	10,177	388	891	200	4	123,854	91.1
Wicklow	56,290	12,888	276	693	294	5	70,880	79.0
Total of LEINSTER.	1,094,825	157,522	12,050	7,006	7,414	163	1,278,989	85.6
Province of MUNSTER.								
Clare	188,508	2,669	165	65	48	2	141,457	97.0
Cork	449,872	38,994	2,380	2,924	1,405	32	495,607	82.6
Kerry	194,283	5,897	213	350	222	4	201,039	96.0
Limerick	171,465	7,808	405	561	360	3	180,632	93.3
Tipperary	188,115	10,211	487	574	224	1	199,612	94.2
Waterford	107,141	4,549	337	295	445	1	112,768	95.0
Total of MUNSTER.	1,249,384	70,128	3,987	4,769	2,804	43	1,331,115	93.8
Province of ULSTER.								
Antrim County (exclusive of Belfast, part of)	51,560	45,212	116,813	3,427	10,561	126	227,729	22.7
Armagh	75,709	53,890	26,077	4,884	3,109	8	163,177	46.4
Belfast, Borough	59,975	58,410	71,521	9,141	9,010	65	208,122	28.8
Carriekfergus (Co. of the Town)	1,169	1,746	5,525	435	1,127	7	10,009	11.7
Cavan	164,685	10,022	4,366	1,088	285	...	129,476	80.9
Donegal	157,608	24,759	20,784	2,014	870	...	209,035	76.5
Down	76,090	56,514	90,801	3,891	11,736	56	248,190	30.9
Fermanagh	47,359	30,874	1,708	4,868	57	13	84,379	55.8
Londonderry (Co. and City)	73,274	31,596	54,727	938	4,426	30	164,991	44.4
Monaghan	75,714	18,623	12,213	544	652	2	102,748	73.7
Tyrone	109,793	44,266	38,564	3,597	1,499	10	197,719	55.5
Total of ULSTER ...	833,566	379,402	451,629	34,825	49,332	321	1,748,975	47.8
Province of CONNAUGHT.								
Galway	234,088	6,862	549	324	81	1	242,005	96.7
Lettim	81,470	7,735	297	833	37	...	90,372	90.2
Mayo	238,262	5,675	925	275	174	1	245,212	97.1
Rosecommon	127,813	4,137	307	165	67	1	132,490	96.5
Sligo	101,483	8,213	881	642	359	...	111,578	90.9
Total of CONNAUGHT	783,116	32,522	3,059	2,289	718	2	821,657	95.3
Total of IRELAND	3,960,891	639,574	470,734	48,839	64,268	530	5,174,896	76.5

The following table shows the percentages of each religious denomination in each province :¹

Provinces.	Roman Catholics.	Protestant Episcopalians.	Presbyterians.	Methodists.	All other Persuasions.
Leinster	85·6	12·3	0·9	0·6	0·6
Munster	93·8	5·3	0·8	0·4	0·2
Ulster	47·8	21·8	25·9	2·0	2·5
Connaught	95·3	3·9	0·4	0·3	0·1
Ireland	76·5	12·4	9·1	0·9	1·1

It will be seen from the foregoing tables that, save in the province of Ulster, the religion of the majority of the people is Roman Catholic; and the Census Commissioners have pointed out that the religion of that province, reduced for purposes of comparison to a basis of 1000, comprise 478 Roman Catholics, 218 Protestant Episcopalians,² 259 Presbyterians, 20 Methodists, and 25 members of all other denominations.

¹ See Statistical Maps of Ireland, illustrating by shades the "Religion," "Education," "Wealth," "Pauperism," &c., of each county, compiled by W. Leigh Bernard, and published as a supplement to *The Graphic* of 5th June, 1886.

² It will be remembered that the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland became in 1800 by the Act of Union, a part of the United Churches of England and Ireland,

EMIGRATION.

Previous to 1st May, 1851, no returns as to emigration have been published, but as has been stated, upwards of 3,000,000 persons emigrated from Ireland between that date and

and was in 1869 disestablished and disendowed by the operation of "The Irish Church Act, 1869"; and it is a notable fact that the only Irish bishop who supported the passing of the measure in the House of Lords at that time has been recently elected to fill the position of Protestant Primate of all Ireland.

The results of the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland form an important portion of Irish history, and it may be useful to mention that out of $17\frac{1}{2}$ millions, the value of the Church property, the sum of $10\frac{1}{2}$ millions was paid as compensation for clerical and other interests, leaving an approximate surplus of 7 millions, of which about $6\frac{1}{2}$ millions has already been appropriated in paying 372,331*l.* as compensation to the Royal College of Maynooth for the loss of its Parliamentary grant; 750,000*l.* to the Presbyterian and other Protestant Non-conformist bodies, for the loss of the Parliamentary Grant of 38,000*l.* a year, known as the *Regium Donum*, instituted by King Charles II.; 2,900,000*l.* for educational purposes; and about $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions in Grants for Relief of Distress, Sea Fisheries, &c. The Disestablished Church of Ireland has been very successful as a voluntary Church, notwithstanding the enormous difficulties with which it has had to contend, and it appears from the last report of its representative body that it possesses a capital of almost $7\frac{1}{4}$ millions, of which about three millions have been contributed by friends of the Church in the United Kingdom during the last fifteen years.

the 31st December, 1885, of whom about two-thirds settled in the United States and Canada.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE LAND.

Previous to the reign of King Henry VIII. the feuds between the ancient Irish and the English or Norman adventurers were confined to dispossessing the Irish chieftains of their lands for purposes of plunder, but the Reformation imported a new element of antagonism into the conflict, and added religious animosity to race hatred and National hostility. The people perished in thousands for their faith, and whole districts were depopulated. Those who would not adopt the reformed faith were excluded from Parliament, from all municipal corporations, from the bench, the bar, and the magistracy, as well as the franchise and jury-box, and were forbidden to hold, purchase, or inherit land.

The confiscation of the property of the religious houses by King Henry VIII. led to the distribution of lands, of the then annual value of about 32,000*l.* a year, amongst the English composing the King's Council in Dublin and others, at real or nominal prices. This was followed in subsequent reigns by the plantation of Leix and Offaly : of Munster, Ulster, and Leinster.

The names of the persons who obtained grants of land at the time of the several plantations named are given in the Carew Manuscripts and other historical records, but it is difficult in most cases to identify those persons with the present owners, but the transfer of the land to Protestants from the Roman Catholic proprietors was so wholesale that at THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY SEVEN-EIGHTHS OF THE WHOLE AREA OF IRELAND HAD BECOME THE PROPERTY OF PROTESTANT OWNERS.

If the Protestant owners had conciliated the natives, and recognised the duties which the ownership of property properly entails, the present condition of Ireland might be very different; but as the adventurers who obtained estates in Ireland usually returned to England to enjoy their plunder, leaving their estates to be managed by agents, a system of absenteeism has grown up which has become the curse of the country.

Numerous large owners of lands in Ireland at the present day have not even a residence in the country, and those who have residences rarely occupy them, save for a very short season each year.

The list of owners of land published by the Government in 1876, commonly called the *Irish Domesday Book*, gives the acreage and valuation in each county of the several owners, and the following list of a few of the largest owners is extracted therefrom :—

Owner.	Acre- age.	Valua- tion.	Owner.	Acre- age.	Valua- tion.
		£			£
Abercorn, Duke of . . .	63,557	35,802	King-Harman, E. R. . .	72,913	40,105
Bessborough, Earl of . .	34,675	21,312	Lansdowne, Marquis of .	121,349	32,942
Clanricarde, Marquis of .	52,601	20,836	Leinster, Duke of . . .	68,271	47,646
Conyngham, Marquis of .	156,973	32,644	Leslie, Sir John, Bart. .	49,968	21,051
Devonshire, Duke of . . .	60,086	34,380	Lucan, Earl of	60,602	18,119
Devon, Earl of	33,026	14,525	O'Neill, Lord	64,163	44,947
Dillon, Viscount	89,320	21,773	Ormonde, Marquis of . .	27,804	16,357
Donegall, Marquis of . . .	22,996	19,208	Palmer, Sir Roger, Bart.	94,762	22,285
Downshire, Marquis of .	110,273	91,563	Powercourt, Viscount . .	51,155	15,267
Ely, Marquis of	49,362	23,432	Sligo, Marquis of	114,881	16,157
Fitzwilliam, Earl of . . .	91,748	47,854	Ventry, Lord	93,629	17,067
Herbert, Henry A.	47,238	10,547	Wallace, Sir R., Bart. . .	61,058	74,189
Kenmare, Earl of	118,606	34,473	Waterford, Marquis of .	66,684	32,749

It will be observed, by any careful reader of the Government return of Irish landowners, that many of them are descendants of original planters, and it is not to be wondered that landowners who have enjoyed for a lengthened period almost undisputed sway over their lands and tenants, should be conservative in their ideas as to reforms of the Constitution, or that they should exercise their interest in checking the desires of a majority of the population.

THE INDUSTRIES OF IRELAND.

The chief industry in Ireland at present is agriculture, which may be attributed to English interference with Irish industries, owing to various laws passed by the English Parliament for the express purpose of annihilating the trades and manufactures of Ireland.

Previous to the Restoration of King Charles II. Ireland enjoyed every commercial advantage in common with England, and it was not until 1663 that any restriction was placed on Irish trade. In that year the Act 15 Car. II. was drawn to amend the Navigation Act of 1660, and the word "Ireland" omitted therefrom. This omission, it is believed, was at the time an inadvertence, but advantage was subsequently taken of it to the prejudice of Ireland—whereby, for all purposes of trade, ships built in Ireland, and navigated by the people thereof, were in a different position from British ships. The transaction was described by Edmund Burke in the following words, in the British House of Commons, 6th May, 1778 :

"In the 12 Car. II. the Navigation Acts passed, extended to Ireland as well as to England. A kind of left-handed policy, however, had deprived her of the freedom she enjoyed under that Act, and she had ever since remained under the most cruel, oppressive, and unnatural restrictions."

It can scarcely be believed that the Act 18 Car. II. c. 2, declared the importation of Irish cattle into England to be "a publick and common nuisance," and the Act was made perpetual by 32 Car. II. c. 11. Irish cattle were not readmitted into England until authorized by the Act 32 Geo. II. c. 11.

The exportation to Ireland from the British plantations abroad of tobacco, sugar, cotton-

wool, ginger, indigo, &c., was prohibited by an Act in 1670, in which it is mentioned that this restraint was intended by the Statute of 1663, though not effectively expressed therein. See 22 and 23 Car. II. c. 26.

The results of such restrictive legislation was that cattle became unsaleable in Ireland, and the people had no money to pay the parliamentary subsidies. The Irish people at this period, being deprived of their trade, set to work to improve the manufacturing industries of the country. In this task they received great assistance from James, the first Duke of Ormonde, then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, who, with the consent of the king, passed an order in council prohibiting the importation from Scotland of sundry woollen and linen manufactures, which drew large sums of money out of the country.

Having brought into the kingdom persons acquainted with the business, he formed manufactories at Clonmel, Kilkenny, and Carrick-on-Suir, and established a council of trade; but as an extension of woollen manufacturing in Ireland tended to lessen the export of wool to England, the manufacturers there influenced the English legislature to discourage Irish manufactures, and eventually imposed such duties (by an Act of 1698) on manufactured woollens imported from Ireland into England, as to exclude them from the English markets. In complaining of this trade antagonism, Dean

Swift says :—" At the passing of this fatal Act the condition of our trade was glorious and flourishing, though no way interfering with the English ; we made no broad cloth above six shillings per yard ; coarse druggets, baize, and shalloons, worsted damasks, strong draught works, slight half-works, and stuffs, were the only product of our looms ; these were partly consumed by the meanest of our people, and partly sent to the northern nations, from which we had in exchange timber, iron, hemp, flax, pitch, tar, and hard dollars."

In 1696 an Act was passed to encourage the linen trade in Ireland, and permitted all productions of hemp and flax to be admitted duty free from Ireland into England, an advantage over foreign manufacturers estimated to be equal to 25 per cent.

This Act was intended as a compensation for the loss of the woollen trade, and it was expected that Ireland would have no competition with England or Scotland. Mr. Lecky thus describes what has been termed the breach of the Linen Compact :—" The main industry of Ireland had been deliberately destroyed, because it had so prospered that English manufacturers had begun to regard it as a competitor with their own. It is true, indeed, that a promise was made that the linen and hempen manufactures should be encouraged as a compensation, but even if it had been a just principle that a nation

should be restricted by force of law to one or two forms of industry, there was no proportion between that which was destroyed and that which was to be favoured, and no real reciprocity established between the two countries." And again, in referring to the vicissitudes of the linen manufacture, the same writer observes :— "The English utterly suppressed the existing woollen manufacture in Ireland in order to reserve that industry entirely to themselves, but the English and Scotch continued as usual their manufacture of linen. The Irish trade was ruined in 1699, but no legislative encouragement was given to the Irish linen manufacture till 1705, when, at the urgent petition of the Irish Parliament, the Irish were allowed to export their white and brown linens, but these only to the British Colonies, and they were not permitted to bring any colonial goods in return. The Irish linen manufacture was undoubtedly encouraged by bounties, but not until 1743, when the country had sunk into a condition of appalling wretchedness. In spite of the compact of 1698 the hempen manufacture was so discouraged that it positively ceased. Disabling duties were imposed on Irish sail-cloth imported into England. Irish checked, striped, and dyed linens were absolutely excluded from the colonies. They were virtually excluded from England by the imposition of a duty of 30 per cent., and Ireland was not allowed to participate in the bounties

granted for the exportation of these descriptions of linen from Great Britain to foreign countries."

Restrictions were placed on the glass trade, silk, hops, Irish beer and malt, and other branches of trade which ultimately caused Edmund Burke to ask, "Is Ireland united to the crown of Great Britain for no other purpose than that we should counteract the bounty of Providence in her favour, and in proportion as that bounty has been liberal that we are to regard it as an evil which is to be met with in every sort of corrective?"

The annihilation of the woollen trade led Irishmen to consider whether England had a right to legislate for Ireland in any way, and their agitation led to the passing of the Acts of 1779 and 1780, removing restrictions on foreign trade, and to the Irish Volunteer movement, which culminated in the Act of 1782, which established what is known as "Grattan's Parliament," and may well be described in Grattan's own words in the Irish House of Commons on the 16th April, 1782:—

"I found Ireland on her knees; I watched over her with an eternal solicitude; I have traced her progress from injuries to arms, and from arms to liberty—spirit of Swift, spirit of Molyneux, your genius has prevailed—Ireland is now a nation."

ENGLISH LAWS IN IRELAND.

The following is a list of the chief laws which led to Irish agitations during the last four centuries :—

I.—*Laws in Restraint of Trade.*

1663. The Act of 15 Car. II., commonly called “The Navigation Act, 1663,” and entitled “An Act for the encouragement of trade,” prohibited all *exports* from Ireland to the colonies, except victuals, servants, horses, and salt for the fisheries of New England and Newfoundland, and also prevented by a penalty the importation of Irish cattle into England. The thirteenth section of the Act states that “a very great part of the richest and best land of this kingdom (England) is, and cannot so well otherwise be employed and made use of as in the feeding and fattening of cattle, and that by the coming in of late in vast numbers of cattle already fatted such lands are in many places much fallen, and like daily to fall more in their rents and values, and in consequence other lands also, to the great prejudice, detriment, and impoverishment of this kingdom.”

1666. The Act 18 Car. II. declared to be “a publick and common nuisance” the importation of Irish cattle into England.

1680. The Act 32 Car. II. prohibited the importation into England of Irish butter and cheese, and made perpetual the previous enactment respecting the importation of Irish cattle, and although Irish cattle were temporarily readmitted into England in 1758-59 by the 32 Geo. II. c. 11, the objectionable enactment was not entirely repealed until 1825, when the Act 6 Geo. IV. c. 105 was passed.

1670-71. The Act 22 and 23 Car. II. c. 26 prohibited the exportation to Ireland from the English plantations of tobacco, sugar, and other products grown in the said plantations.

1698-99. The Act of 11 William III. c. 10, passed for the encouragement of English manufactures, prohibited the export of wool and of woollen manufactured goods from Ireland, under a penalty of 500*l.* for each offence, in addition to the forfeiture of the goods and the ship in which they were transported.

1710. The Act 9 Anne c. 12 prohibited the importation into Ireland of hops, save those of British growth, and the same prohibition was re-enacted by statutes passed by Parliaments held in the reign of George II.

1745. By a statute of George II. it was enacted that no glass other than the manufacture of England or Scotland shall be imported into Ireland, and that no glass of the manufacture of Ireland was to be exported. These statutes have been all repealed.

II.—*Laws to fetter Irish Legislation.*

1494. The 10 Henry VII. c. 4, an Irish statute, commonly called "Poynings Act," was passed by the instrumentality of Sir Edward Poynings, whereby it was enacted that "no parliament be holden, hereafter, in the said land (of Ireland), but at such season as the king's lieutenant and council there first do certify to the king, under the great seal of that land, the causes and considerations, and all such Acts as to them seemeth, should pass in this same parliament; and such causes, considerations, and Acts, affirmed by the king and his council, to be good and expedient for that land, and his license thereupon, as well in affirmation of the said causes and Acts, as to summon the said parliament under his great seal of England had and obtained; that done, a parliament to be had and holden after this form and effect before rehearsed; and if any parliament be holden in that land, hereafter, contrary to the form and provision aforesaid, it be deemed void, and of none effect in law."

This Act bound Irish parliaments for almost three hundred years, and was without doubt the most singular Act ever passed by an

independent legislature, and it should be remembered that at the time this Act was passed all English statutes then existing in England were made of force in Ireland. The Act was repealed by the Irish Parliament in 1782.

III.—*The Penal Laws.*

The first of the Irish penal laws was enacted in 1695 (Irish statute 7 Will. III. c. 4), and provided that every one who sent a child abroad, or went abroad himself, to be trained in the Roman Catholic religion, should be liable to the forfeiture to the Crown of all his real and personal estate, and be disabled from acting as an executor, administrator, or guardian, from taking the benefit of any gift or legacy, or from filling any office.

Any common informer was at liberty to set the law in motion, and recover half the forfeiture, the burden of proof of innocence being cast on the person accused.

A penalty of £20, or the alternative of three months' imprisonment, was the punishment enacted for any papist who kept a school or taught scholars in a private house.

A second statute was passed in the same year (7 Will. III. c. 5) for the purpose of disarming the Roman Catholic population and other objects. All papists were required by

this Act, on or before 1st March, 1696, to deliver up to the justices of the peace in their neighbourhood all armour, arms, and ammunition in their possession, save and except those persons who had the benefit of the Treaty of Limerick, who were permitted to keep one sword, one case of pistols, and one gun, "for fowling" purposes.

No manufacturer of firearms was permitted to take a Roman Catholic apprentice under a penalty of £20, payable by both master and apprentice, and it was further provided that any apprentice who was suspected of professing the Roman Catholic faith might be tendered the oath of allegiance as a test.

A further provision prevented a papist from keeping a horse of a higher value than £5, and empowered any Protestant to obtain a search warrant from a magistrate, enabling him to search for and secure any such horses. If the informer so found any valuable horses in the possession of a papist he might, upon tender to the owner of five guineas for each horse, take possession of any such horse or horses.

The third penal statute was passed two years later (9 Will. III. c. 1), and provided that any Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, whether bishops, jesuits, monks, or "regular" clergy, should, on or before 1st May, 1698, depart out of the kingdom, or suffer imprisonment until they could be transported to the Continent.

The punishment for any ecclesiastic who ventured to return to Ireland was hanging, drawing, and quartering, such persons being held to be guilty of high treason.

Penalties were also to be inflicted on persons who harboured any ecclesiastics who ventured to return to Ireland.

In 1702 an Act was passed (2 Anne c. 7) by way of modification of the last cited statute for the registration of the resident Popish Clergy, and provision made for the grant of a pension of 20*l.* a year (afterwards raised to 30*l.*) to any Roman Catholic priest who would turn Protestant.

The penal statute which, perhaps, came home most to many Irishmen, was that affecting social relations by preventing the marriage of Protestants with Roman Catholics. This was carried into effect by the Act 9 Will. III. c. 3, which provided that any Protestant woman having an interest in land, who should marry any person without a certificate from a minister or a justice of the peace, that the husband was a known Protestant, should suffer the forfeiture of her estates to the next Protestant heir-at-law.

Any person performing the ceremony of marriage between any such persons was rendered liable to a year's imprisonment, in addition to a penalty of 20*l.* A Protestant man who married a Roman Catholic woman was to be subjected to all the disabilities of

a papist, unless his wife should be converted within twelve months to the satisfaction of a Protestant bishop.

The Act 10 Will. III. c. 13 was passed to disqualify Roman Catholics from practising as solicitors without taking the oaths, under a penalty of 100*l.* (afterwards raised to 200*l.*), and any solicitor who had not taken the oath was disabled from acting as executor or administrator or taking the benefit of any legacy. The Act further prohibited any solicitor from practising unless he educated his children in the Protestant faith, and also forbade him from taking a Roman Catholic clerk. The same Act prevented a papist from serving on a grand jury.

Solicitors were further affected by the Act of 7 George II. c. 5, which prevented anyone from practising as a solicitor unless he had been a Protestant since the age of fourteen, or had been duly articled to some clerk in Chancery in England or Ireland.

In consequence of the evasion of the foregoing statutes Acts were passed in the second and eight years of Anne, which *inter alia* enacted as follows:—

The Act 2 Anne c. 6 provided—

That any person who perverted a Protestant should be guilty of *præmunire*.

That any person who sent an infant beyond the sea without a license should be liable to the penalties of 7 Will. III. c. 4.

That no papist was to be guardian of a child under a penalty of 500*l*.

That the court might appoint a Protestant guardian of a conforming child, and order his Popish parent to pay for his maintenance and education.

That lands held in fee simple by a Roman Catholic parent should only be deemed to be held by him as tenant in tail, or for a life tenancy in the event of his eldest son becoming a Protestant, and as such entitled to inherit the whole.

That if the sons of a papist were also papists the estates were to descend in equal shares amongst them all, thus ordaining one law of descent for each creed.

That no papist was to be permitted to purchase or hold any mortgage on land, nor even to take a lease of more than thirty-one years in length, the condition of such lease being that the reserved rent was not to be less than two-thirds of the full annual value.

That no papist who shall not conform within six months after 1st February, 1703, shall be capable to inherit any estate by descent, devise, or otherwise, and any such estate shall during his life or until his conformity pass to the next Protestant heir-at-law.

That no papist shall vote at an election without taking the oaths.

That no person shall hold office, civil or

military, without taking the oaths, receive the Sacrament on Sunday in church, and subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation.

The Act 8 Anne c. 3 provided that all fines levied on land, and all recoveries suffered to bar a Protestant's right, shall be void, unless the sale or mortgage thereby affected be a *bonâ fide* transaction for valuable consideration in favour of a Protestant.

That the wife of a papist who shall conform shall upon her conversion be permitted to obtain from the court a jointure charged on her recusant husband's estates, and on one-third of his real and personal chattels. And in like manner children who shall conform may obtain an allowance not exceeding one-third of their father's income.

That no papist trader shall take more than two apprentices, except he be engaged in the linen trade.

The disabilities of Roman Catholics were further increased in the first year of the reign of George I., when an Act was passed (1 Geo. II. c. 9) by which every Roman Catholic was disfranchised, and thereby deprived of his vote both at parliamentary and municipal elections.

It should be mentioned in conclusion that all the penal laws have been repealed, from time to time, save one which renders a Roman Catholic ineligible to hold the office of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

W. LEIGH BERNARD.

C. S. PARNELL'S EMPHATIC DENIAL.

So much Tory capital has been made out of these words put into the mouth of Mr. Parnell, that we think it will be useful to record his historical contradiction of them in Parliament.

Mr. Trevelyan : He did not see anything very dishonourable in what Mr. Finnerty said, and he thought it was exceedingly like the language, likewise far from dishonourable, which the hon. member for Cork himself was reported to have used when he said that "NONE OF US IN IRELAND OR AMERICA WILL BE SATISFIED UNTIL WE HAVE DESTROYED THE LAST LINK WHICH KEEPS IRELAND BOUND TO ENGLAND."

Mr. Parnell interposed, amid Home Rule cheers, and said : Mr. Speaker—It is not the first time that this calumny has been uttered against me in this House, and as I contradicted the statement the first time it was ever made some two or three years ago in this House by the present Lord Ashbourne, I think I am entitled to ask the right hon. gentleman to give the authority for the quotation he has just made—(Home Rule cheers)—the date of the speech, and the place where I am alleged to have made it. (Renewed Home Rule cheers.)

Mr. Trevelyan replied that the place was Cincinnati. If the hon. member considered that the words which he read were calumnious he withdrew them with regret. (Laughter.)

He did not understand the meaning of that laugh. If the hon. member thought them derogatory to him in any sense he would withdraw them, and express regret for having used them. (Hear, hear.) But, for his own part, he did not consider them disgraceful in any way.

Mr. Parnell: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I ask the right hon. gentleman for the date, the place, and the newspaper in which I was reported to have uttered these words. The right hon. gentleman has not given me the date; he has given me the place. Perhaps the House will allow me to say that I have been only once in Cincinnati in my life, and I have by me a verbatim report—(order)—of both my speeches made at Cincinnati on the day in question, five years ago, and that no such words or any one of the words which the right hon. gentleman had quoted appears in these speeches. I may also further state—(order)—that I have carefully looked over the reports of my speeches in other parts of America made in 1879 and 1880, but I cannot find any word or words such as those that have been quoted by the right hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.) With his permission I will send him the newspaper I brought back five years ago containing the original report of my speech.—*House of Commons*, May 24, 1886.

FORMATION OF THE "IRISH PROTESTANT HOME RULE ASSOCIATION."

IMPORTANT INAUGURAL RESOLUTIONS.

At the meeting the following were the resolutions, carried unanimously :—

1. That we pledge ourselves to support the principle of National self-government, and to advocate its application to Ireland, and we justify our action at this crisis of our country's history :—

1st. On national grounds. Because under the present system of government from an Imperial centre the local necessities of Ireland, besides being disregarded and misunderstood, are controlled and impeded by the exigencies of the party politics of Great Britain ; and because the opinions of the Irish people do not obtain adequate expression in the Legislature for their country, and are altogether ignored in its Administration.

2nd. On religious grounds. Because the practical exclusion of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen from positions of official authority, honour, emolument, and responsibility, and the undue monopoly of these positions of trust by those opposed to them in

religious doctrine, and particularly by those belonging to the party of historical ascendancy, creates feelings of sectarian distrust and animosity, which are really subversive of the cause of true religion.

3rd. On social and commercial grounds; because in consequence of the unsettled state of the country through the protracted nature of the national struggle the minds of the people are distracted, their feelings exasperated, and their energies diverted from steady industry and commercial enterprise, for the success of which peace, order, and security are so essential; and because, in consequence of the unequal distribution of positions of trust amongst the various religious sections of the community, bad feelings are engendered, personal intercourse is strained, and society is disorganised.

4th. On Imperial grounds; because the justifiable and unavoidable dissatisfaction of the Irish people with the existing system of government makes Ireland a weak link in the Imperial chain, and, therefore, the extension of legislative and administrative autonomy to Ireland is not only demanded by a sense of justice to the Irish people, but is dictated by wisdom and prudence in the interests of the Empire of Great Britain and Ireland, whose integrity, legitimate extension, and increasing power and influence in the world, we have deeply at heart.

5th. We further justify our action, in so far

as it is distinct from the efforts of our Roman Catholic brethren, by the circumstances and necessities of the time, and as a means of affording a moral support to those who think with us in this matter, and in order the better to combat and neutralise more or less definitely-expressed fears of persecution of the minority by the majority ; and with this object in view we hereby emphatically declare our entire confidence in our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, and our firm belief that they are individually and collectively incapable of any attempt to restrict our civil or religious liberties ; and we take this opportunity of expressing our sympathy with them while they labour under this unmerited suspicion.

2. That, in accordance with the principles expressed in the foregoing resolution and the terms of the circular convening this meeting, we hereby agree to form an Association consisting of Protestants in Ireland, for the purpose of furthering the cause of national legislative independence in Ireland.

3. That the Association be called "The Irish Protestant Home Rule Association."

IRISH POLITICAL METHODISM.

BY THOMAS SHILLING, JUN., OF PORTADOWN.

RECENT political developments in Irish Methodism may not be without their compensating advantages if English Methodists, thus afforded an opportunity of observing the evil results of this strange departure from the traditions and practices of the past, are confirmed in their exclusion of politics from the Church. Severe as have been the political crises through which these countries have passed since the days of John Wesley, never before has the organisation of the Society been prostituted to the purposes of a political propaganda. District meetings, leaders' meetings, Committee of Privileges, and individual ministers, as with a continual discharge of ecclesiastical ordnance, are fulminating their anathemas against all who see in the Government proposals for Irish reforms the only basis for a solution of the Irish difficulty. "The interests of religion are imperilled." "Protestantism is at stake," "The Loyal will be put down, and the Disloyal will be set over them." These and other like reasons are urged in vindication of the course the Irish Methodist Church is pursuing on the question of the hour.

Passing by for the moment the obvious inconsistency between this action and the teaching and example of Christ and His apostles,

and its sad travesty of the genius and spirit of that kingdom which is not of this world, let us inquire how far the interests of religion may be imperiled, or true Protestantism be placed at any disadvantage by the establishment of Home Rule in Ireland. Irish Protestantism has always rested upon the adventitious aids of social position and influence. One section of it at least has always been imbued with the tone and spirit of an odious political ascendancy which, unfortunately, during periods of excitement like the present, leavens the whole lump. Its cardinal doctrine is that the "Roman Catholics must be kept down." The fruits of its temper and teaching are seen in the howling on the public highway of imprecations against Papists, Pope, and Popery, expressed in expletives more fiery (in a double sense) than refined. In this guise the religion (save the mark!) of Protestants is recommended to the masses of the Irish people. The thoughts and feelings of a devout Irish Roman Catholic, on being presented with the ordinary type of true-blue Protestantism, can be easily imagined. You desire his conversion, and you place your hand upon the shoulder of your Protestant neighbour, and say, "My Roman Catholic friend and brother, forsake the creed in which you were cradled, and accept the truth. Behold the truth exemplified in the character of my fellow-Protestant. He curses the Pope; he hates his fellow man;

he denies your right to equal political privileges with himself. How great will be the improvement in your character by becoming like him !”

The truth is that Irish Protestantism stands discredited to-day by its results. It has failed to win the sympathy or respect of the great mass of the Irish people. The interests of religion endangered, forsooth, by the enfranchisement of Protestantism from the trammels of State patronage and class privileges ! Endangered by its deliverance from the great barrier which has hitherto shut it out from any possibility of gaining the goodwill of the masses of the Irish people ! Give it free scope to work out its essential truths, and it must live and flourish. Let Irish Protestants abandon those adventitious aids which have been the source of their weakness hitherto ; and, ashamed of that pusillanimous cry of despair, now the disgrace of the Irish Protestant churches, confidently rest upon the right arm of that King whose Kingdom they seek to establish. Let Irish Methodists, at least, returning to the old paths, become again “ the friends of all, the enemies of none ” ; and while, as good citizens, they address themselves to work out the best social results under the new circumstances into which their country is coming, let them, as a Christian Church exhibiting the true spirit and mind of Christ, commend His service to the Irish nation.

**ADDRESS SIGNED BY FIVE HUNDRED LIBERAL
PROTESTANTS OF BELFAST.**

PRESENTED TO

THE PRIME MINISTER

By MR. J. A. DICKSON, *late M.P. for Tyrone.*

May 29, 1886.

It is impossible to deny the fact that among the Protestant population of Ulster, the Government Bill for establishing a legislative body in Ireland has been received with much disfavour, and that the very existence of a minority among them who take a calmer, and as we believe and hope, a more sensible view of the situation, might hardly be suspected. To prove that there is such a minority is the object of the letter which we now venture to address to you. If the high statesmanship for which we have been accustomed to look to you as the greatest living exponent demands that a separate legislature shall be given to Ireland, and that it affords the best prospects of a real union of Great Britain and Ireland and of closing the long chapter of discord and disunion which has for centuries marked the connection between the countries, then we say we welcome the approaching legis-

lation with all its possibilities. It was natural and easy for the Protestant minority in Ireland to appear loyal and contented so long as they had practically the administration of the laws for the entire community, and were able to influence legislation in their own interest, and equally natural that they should feel selfishly alarmed and indignant when the bulk of the population newly enfranchised expressed, as they did on the very first opportunity, their objection to the continuance of the old system. We believe that an Irish Parliament, constructed by the wisdom of the Parliament of the United Kingdom on the basis of the Government scheme, can be intrusted with the home legislation for our country, without the risk of any retaliatory measures against the minority, however conscious that minority may be of deserving some retribution for the mis-government of past generations. As Protestants and descendants of Protestant settlers, we have never experienced the want of that nationality which we honestly believe is keenly felt by millions of our fellow-inhabitants of this island. We cannot but feel that if we lose the voice which we have hitherto had in controlling the destinies of the great British nation, we shall part with some sentiment of dignity, and we hope that it may be found possible to preserve a fair representation of Ireland at Westminster in the decision of

Imperial questions ; at the same time we feel that after a native Parliament is established in Ireland (as we are now confident it will be sooner or later), we shall, while still forming part of the British Empire, find ample work for our best minds in trying to establish in our native land a reign of law and peace in which our countrymen may learn that, although they have not the national wealth or great opportunities and responsibilities of Great Britain, they may yet be a prosperous, contented, and law-abiding people ; and whether the Government Bill pass into law now or later, we feel the most profound belief in the absolutely disinterested purity of your motives in introducing it.

N.B.—These signatures Mr. Dickson stated were collected in a few days, and more than a thousand additions would shortly follow.

**MR. DISRAELI SOLVES THE IRISH PROBLEM
IN ONE SENTENCE.**

BUT we have never gone on the principle of uniformity in building up the fabric of our Empire. The diversity of political constitutions in the British Empire has been the secret of our political success. (Cheers.) In one place only have you failed, and most miserably failed; and that is the place where you have jealously insisted on forcing English religion, an English land system, English ideas of education, and English administration upon a people who have never assimilated them. MR. DISRAELI SAID, "JUSTICE TO IRELAND IS SAID TO MEAN IDENTITY OF INSTITUTIONS WITH ENGLAND. I BELIEVE THAT TO BE THE GREATEST FALLACY THAT CAN BE BROUGHT FORWARD. I HAVE ALWAYS THOUGHT THAT THE GREATEST CAUSE OF MISERY IN IRELAND WAS THE IDENTITY OF INSTITUTIONS WITH ENGLAND, AND I VENTURE TO LAY DOWN AS A PRINCIPLE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND SHOULD BE ON A SYSTEM THE REVERSE OF ENGLAND'S." (Cheers.) I cannot say that I follow Lord Beaconsfield so far as that, but I do feel that in those remarks he stated a very cardinal fact in the situation.—RIGHT HON. JOHN MORLEY, M.P., *Speech, House of Commons, June 3, 1886.*

HISTORICAL RECOLLECTIONS.

MR. O'CONNELL AND SEPARATION.—1830.

THAT such an occurrence should give rise to an angry debate in Parliament is not surprising ; but that such a debate should give occasion to so discreet a man as Sir Robert Peel to indulge in a personal attack upon Mr. O'Connell is calculated to excite other feelings than those of surprise. In the progress of the debate imputations of tyranny or tyrannical intentions on the part of the Government were certainly not spared ; but in consequence of allusions having been made by one of the members to a proclamation then recently issued by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, prohibiting the holding of a meeting, which was intended, some short time previous, to be held in Dublin, to take into consideration a plan for procuring a dissolution of the legislative union, SIR ROBERT PEEL WAS SO RASH AS TO IMPUTE TO MR. O'CONNELL, WHO HAD THERETOFORE NOT TAKEN ANY PART IN THE DEBATE, A DELIBERATE INTENTION TO MATURE A PLAN FOR SEVERING, BY OPEN REBELLION, THE POLITICAL CONNECTION BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

In consequence of this INCONSIDERATE AND BASELESS IMPUTATION, Mr. O'Connell rose, and

NOT ONLY DISCLAIMED SUCH AN INTENTION, but attacked Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues in such terms, and with such powers of sarcasm and invective, as placed him in the first rank of parliamentary orators. Alluding to his having been returned, at the preceding election, by the constituencies of more than one county, he contrasted the political confidence thus reposed in him with that enjoyed by such of his Majesty's ministers as were members of the House, and all of whom sat for what was not inappropriately termed rotten boroughs—not one of them having ventured to solicit the confidence of a popular constituency ; he adverted to the terms of the speech delivered by his Majesty on the opening of the session, and commented as well upon what it expressed as upon what it omitted, and contended, with great force and ingenuity, that while it manifested no disposition to mitigate the sufferings, or relieve the distresses of the people of any part of the empire, DISPLAYED STRONG SYMPATHY WITH DESPOTISM in France, Belgium, Portugal, Turkey, and Poland ; and, alluding to the fact of Sir Henry Hardinge, a military officer, being Secretary for Ireland, imputed the choice made of him to an intention on the part of the Government to introduce a military despotism into that country. Knowing also the state of public feeling in England, Mr. O'Connell described, in strong terms, the sufferings of its people, and their utter neglect by the Govern-

ment. To the Whig party, such a speech was a source of unqualified satisfaction, for from it they derived every advantage they could from its author's assistance, without incurring any obligation for its delivery, and the state of Ireland was a topic which, of all others, they dreaded;—experience soon proved that their fears in this respect were not without foundation.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.—1830.

To those who looked merely upon the surface of public affairs, the conduct of the Whigs with reference to Ireland, appeared to be unaccountable, but the reason, such as it was, was apparent to those who regarded the incongruous elements of which the ministry was composed, and the parties by whom they expected to be supported; for amongst the former were to be found many who did, at one time, belong to the Government of the Duke of Wellington, and among the latter many who embraced the doctrine of parliamentary reform only because the Duke had expressed his determination to oppose every form of it; but more particularly because they could no longer show their zeal for the Constitution in Church and State by periodically accusing their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects of a fixed design to overturn it, forgetting that the most tyrannical monarchs

that ever occupied the English throne were the founders of the Church of England, or were apparently, at least, zealous professors of its doctrines. The truth, however, is, that the greater number of the Tory party, who consented to the passing of what was called the Catholic Emancipation Act, did so only to get rid of a parliamentary question, with reference to which it was found impossible to form a unanimous cabinet; and therefore, to gratify the feelings of those persons who belonged to that numerous class of politicians who view every political question through the medium of expediency, and regard no political evil so great as the loss of official emoluments, and also to bring back, if possible, those who would not vote in favour of that measure, the Duke of Wellington's Government had determined, contrary, as is now well known, to the feelings and wishes of Sir Robert Peel, to render the Act a nullity, so far as the actual enjoyment of an equality of civil rights by Roman Catholics was concerned,—leaving to them the enjoyment of their renovated political capacity to make the most they could of it. And, therefore, although that Government remained in office for eighteen months after the passing of the Act by which Roman Catholics were released from political disability, not a single office was conferred on a member of that body until the merely honorary distinction of King's Counsel was conferred on some Roman Catholic

barristers in the month of July, 1830, when it became apparent that the existence of the Duke's Government was drawing to a close; and even then a line of conduct was adopted with reference to AN INDIVIDUAL, THAT WAS AS UNJUSTIFIABLE AND DISREPUTABLE AS IT WAS IMPOLITIC AND UNJUST. As it was, however, a most unequivocal manifestation of a policy which exercised, in its consequences, a most decided and unexpected influence on the fate of several subsequent Governments, and is not without its political influence to the present day, we shall be rather minute in our details of the circumstances attending it. WHEN IT BECAME APPARENT THAT THE CIVIL DISABILITIES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS WERE TO BE REMOVED, THAT FORMIDABLE BODY, CALLED THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION, AT THE INSTANCE OF ITS LEADER, MR. O'CONNELL, RESOLVED TO TERMINATE ITS OWN EXISTENCE, AND TO ACCEPT, WITH FEELINGS OF GRATITUDE, THE CONCESSION FOR WHICH THEY HAD LONG AND SUCCESSFULLY STRUGGLED; BUT it never occurred to the Roman Catholics that, although their political disability to enjoy the emoluments and honours of public office, whether of the State or of the municipalities, was removed, the actual enjoyment was to be indefinitely postponed. The policy, however, of the Government could not long remain concealed from one who possessed the penetration and commanded the sources of infor-

mation of Mr. O'Connell. After a lapse of some months from the passing of the Emancipation Act symptoms of popular discontent began to manifest themselves in Ireland, particularly with reference to the non-appointment of Roman Catholic gentlemen to the commission of the peace, of Roman Catholic barristers to the honorary distinction of King's Counsel, or of any Roman Catholic layman to any office of honour or emolument in the gift of their Government; but those feelings being treated with disregard, if not contempt, began to give way to others of a deeper character, not a little aggravated by the offensive language applied by the public writers and speakers belonging to the party who had long and uniformly resisted the removal of the disabilities of the Roman Catholics. With an accurate and extensive knowledge of the feelings of the vast majority of the Roman Catholics, and a considerable number of the Protestant population of Ireland, respecting the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland, and as the most effectual means of attracting the attention of the Government to the elements of popular discontent, which were still abundant and within his reach, MR. O'CONNELL, EARLY IN THE YEAR 1830, PUBLICLY ANNOUNCED HIS INTENTION OF AGITATING THE QUESTION, WHICH WAS POPULARLY CALLED THE "REPEAL OF THE UNION." This announcement was at first

regarded as an empty threat, more particularly as the Lord-Lieutenant was, by an Act of Parliament passed for the Suppression of the Catholic Association, empowered to prohibit, by proclamation, the holding of any meeting which should be considered dangerous to the public peace. In the meantime the public press in Ireland, in the interest of the Roman Catholics, complained loudly of the gross evasion of the law passed for their relief, by excluding them from all public offices of honour or emolument. At length the Government of the Duke of Wellington, in the month of July, 1830, and when it saw that there was little hope of its regaining the support of its former adherents, and still less of retaining office, determined to promote several Roman Catholic members of the bar to the office of King's Counsel, a distinction which was then regarded as an honour to be conferred only on professional merit, but which subsequently became, as it has ever since continued in Ireland, a substitute for it in political partizans, but, to the disgrace of the Government, it was resolved to exclude Mr. O'Connell from this well-merited distinction. Accordingly, five Irish Roman Catholic barristers were called within the bar, and Mr. O'Connell left outside of it. It is utterly impossible to account for Sir Robert Peel's consenting to be a party to such despicable conduct. That it was done to annoy Mr. O'Connell, and to gratify the malice

of his political and personal enemies, was obvious; but if ever a party had reason to regret the commission of an act of political folly and meanness, the Tory, or, as it was then termed, the Conservative party, had it, on account of that of which they were thus guilty. It was deliberately perpetrated, because it was well known that the impediment which the penal code put in the way of his enjoyment of well-merited professional rank was one of the stimulants which gave energy to his political conduct for years. He was the oldest, except one, of the Roman Catholic barristers in Ireland; he had been called to the bar thirty-two years before; and, notwithstanding the professional disadvantages under which, as a Roman Catholic, he laboured, he soon, owing to his peculiar qualifications for the successful practice of his profession, acquired practice to as great an extent as it was possible for a member of the outer bar to do; but as he could not discharge the duties, or enjoy the emoluments of a leader, he was daily exposed to the humiliation and injury incidental to his disqualification. For a long time he bore this injustice with all the fortitude of a man whose conscience cannot upbraid him with being the author of his own misfortune. In truth there was not in Ireland a man who felt the effects of the penal code more sensibly than he did: and it was well, perhaps, for those who belonged to his proscribed class that he did so,

for it is probable that to this fact they were mainly indebted for the success which attended his efforts to cast off their fetters, and to lead them in triumph out of the cheerless regions of political degradation to which they and their ancestors had been so long consigned. Stung to the quick by this wanton and unprovoked insult, and knowing the policy which the Government was determined to pursue towards the great majority of the people of Ireland, who had fondly imagined that some atonement would be made for the injustice to which they had been so long subjected, he determined to retaliate upon the parties who had forfeited all claims to the confidence and forbearance of himself, or those whose political leader he had been for so many years. The prospect, however, of the party who had thus excited his hostility being driven from power and the confident expectation that their successors would adopt a different policy, caused him for a time to suspend the execution of his plans ; but when he learned to his utter astonishment, as he very soon did after the resignation of the Duke of Wellington, that the Whigs, confiding in the strength which the adhesion to their party of the followers of the late Mr. Canning, and some of the Tory party, and their own determination to propose a plan for the reformation of the House of Commons would give them, determined to adopt towards

Ireland the policy of their predecessors, and to set him and his party at defiance, he resolved not to leave undone anything which it was in his power to do, in order to render the members of the new Government sensible of the folly of which they were guilty, in resolving to pursue a policy so utterly inconsistent with the previous professions of their leaders.

It was while public affairs and feelings were in this state that Lord Anglesea arrived in Ireland, at the end of December, 1830, to assume for the second time the local Government of Ireland, and it would appear that, to his astonishment, he was not received with the feelings of popular regard which he had attracted to himself at the close of his former viceroyalty; but instead of referring the change to its true cause—the conduct of the new ministry—he attributed it altogether to Mr. O'Connell. Let the cause, however, be what it may, he was greeted from the time of his entrance into the city of Dublin until his arrival at the Castle, with sounds of the human voice which are by no means indicative of popular approbation, and was given to understand in no unequivocal terms that the promotion of his friend, Mr. Doherty, was not regarded with much popular favour.

Soon after his arrival came Mr. Stanley, fully determined to carry out the policy of the Government as regarded Ireland; and as Mr. O'Connell continued to do all in his power

to organise public meetings for discussing the merits of the union, or rather hearing the means by which it had been effected, commented upon by himself and his assistants, AND AS THE GOVERNMENT DID ALL IN ITS POWER TO SUPPRESS THOSE MEETINGS BY PROCLAMATION, THE DEMON OF CIVIL DISCORD AGAIN MOUNTED HER THRONE IN IRELAND, AND ALL THE PASSIONS OF WHICH SHE IS THE OFFSPRING AND THE PARENT, drove public peace out of that unhappy country again into an exile which did not terminate until the grave had closed over Mr. O'Connell himself, nor until every physical, social, and political evil, save civil war and foreign invasion, which a country can suffer, had desolated that kingdom. Determined to crush him if possible, the Marquis of Anglesea and Mr. Stanley, at whose feet the unfortunate country was flung by the British Cabinet, directed a criminal prosecution to be instituted against Mr. O'Connell, not only upon a charge of having actually violated the statute against unlawful associations, but upon a charge of having conspired to evade its provisions. The first step in the prosecution was to arrest Mr. O'Connell and hold him to bail to stand his trial, an indignity which he resented by applying the strongest and coarsest language of reproach, vituperation, and defiance to his prosecutors. He was then indicted in the Court of King's Bench, bills having been

found without hesitation by a grand jury, composed of the members of the then Municipal Corporation of Dublin, between whom and Mr. O'Connell there had long existed very strong feelings of religious and political hostility. The time allowed by the rules of the court for him to plead being very short, he rashly demurred in law to the indictment,—the legal effect of which was to admit the truth of the charges contained in the indictment, and to confine his defence to a denial that they amounted to a criminal offence,—a question to be decided, not by a jury, but by the judges.

Mr. O'Connell had scarcely taken this rash step than he perceived his error, and calling to his aid some of the ablest lawyers then at the Irish bar, who practised in the courts of common law, and who had not been retained by the crown, he was advised to apply to the court for leave to withdraw his demurrer, and plead not guilty, inasmuch as he would thereby have the benefit of a trial by a jury upon the facts, and could, in the event of a verdict of guilty being found against him, take advantage of the supposed insufficiency of the indictment by a motion in arrest of judgment, or a writ of error.

The application so advised having been made, was strongly opposed by the law officers of the crown, but so far successfully sustained by Mr. O'Connell's counsel that the court

granted the application, upon terms, however, so disadvantageous to him, that he suffered the crown to enter judgment against him for want of a plea, and, as the result proved, he substantially attained his object; for as the term (Hilary, 1831) closed before he could be called up for judgment, he was enabled to attend Parliament in the interval between it and the subsequent Easter term, and, during this interval, events occurred which manifested to his prosecutors THE FOLLY OF THE POLICY UPON WHICH THEY HAD ACTED WHEN THEY WANTONLY PROVOKED THE RESENTMENT OF SUCH A MAN.

THE COERCION ACT.—1833.

On the 12th February, 1833, Lord Althorp, as ministerial leader, applied for leave to bring in a bill “to alter and amend the laws relating to the temporalities of the Church of Ireland;”¹ but, although his lordship’s motion was not opposed, the bill was not brought in or read a first time until the 11th of March. The motion was, in fact, brought forward prematurely in order to afford the Government an opportunity to state, as it were, the leading provisions of one of the measures which they intended to propose for the removal of some of the grievances which

¹ *Annual Register*, 1833, p. 35.

they admitted the people of Ireland had reason to complain, as regarded the Church establishment.

The conduct pursued by the Government on this occasion had, when taken in connection with the next measure to which we shall have to advert, very much the appearance of a political trick, and certainly not by any means a creditable one, for during the subsequent stages of the bill they consented, at the instance of the Church party, to divest it of almost all the provisions which had a tendency to conciliate the people of Ireland; but, before it underwent this alteration, ministers contrived to secure the passing of one of the most tyrannical, and, in a constitutional point of view, objectionable statutes that is to be found upon the records of Parliament. A measure of which Lord Grey had bitter reason to regret, for it not only exposed him and his party to unmeasured censure and well-deserved reproach, but ultimately led to the total destruction of his government.

The provisions of this Church bill, and the manner in which they were ultimately dealt with we shall state hereafter. Their merits did not come fully under discussion, nor were some of the most important of them abandoned until ministers had secured the PASSING OF WHAT WAS PROPERLY CALLED, "THE COERCION ACT."

On the 15th of February, and while the people of Ireland, and such of the people of Great Britain as felt an interest in Irish affairs, or entertained any sympathy for the sufferings of their Irish fellow-subjects, were under an impression that the grievances connected with the Irish Church were about to be redressed, Earl Grey himself introduced into the House of Lords a bill for the more effectual suppression of local disturbances and dangerous associations in Ireland.

In his opening speech, he said he did so without applying for a committee to inquire into the circumstances which rendered it necessary, as he said the evils to be remedied were so great and so notorious as to render inquiry superfluous. He stated the provisions in detail, and that they were taken from pre-existing statutes, which had been from time to time in force in Ireland, but had expired.

It was proposed that the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland should be at liberty whenever he thought proper to proclaim any given district—in short, all Ireland—and THEREUPON ALL PERSONS WERE PROHIBITED FROM BEING ABSENT FROM THEIR HOUSES FROM AN HOUR AFTER SUNSET UNTIL SUNRISE, UNLESS THEY COULD GIVE GOOD REASON FOR THEIR BEING ABROAD, UNDER THE PENALTY OF BEING FOUND GUILTY OF A MISDEMEANOUR. It was also proposed that military courts should be established to try all offenders under the act, many of which

were made felonies, and subjected the offender to transportation. A power was given to enter houses in search of arms, and persons refusing to produce them were subject to punishment by court-martial. It was further proposed to be enacted that when any individual arrested under the act within three months after his arrest, sued out a writ of habeas corpus, it should be a sufficient return to the writ that the person so detained was kept in custody on a charge of an offence perpetrated in a proclaimed district; in short, the provisions were of so penal a character, and so utterly inconsistent with every principle of civil liberty as to be scarcely credible if they were not to be found upon the face of the statute book. Nevertheless, such were the feelings with which the state of Ireland was viewed by a large majority of the Lords, who were the supporters of Government, and the desire of their Conservative adversaries to widen the breach between the Government and the people of Ireland, that the bill passed their House without having been productive of a single division. It was dealt with, however, in the House of Commons in a very different manner by a minority, composed principally of the members returned under the influence of Mr. O'Connell, occasionally augmented by some of the English and Scotch members who usually supported ministers. In consequence of this opposition, the bill did not pass the

Commons until the 29th of March, and, during its progress, almost all the other public business of the House was suspended. The debates to which it gave rise were of the most acrimonious and personal character, but were principally conducted by Mr. Stanley as the supporter, and Mr. O'Connell as the antagonist of the bill.

Immediately after the passing of the act the Lord-Lieutenant issued two proclamations under it. By one he declared illegal a society which had been founded by Mr. O'Connell to aid him in his agitation respecting the repeal of the Union; and by the other, he proclaimed the city and county of Kilkenny, in which the opposition to the payment of tithes, or the composition established in lieu of tithes, continued to be carried on with greater violence than in any other part of Ireland; indeed, in almost all the other counties agrarian disturbances had in a great measure subsided, even before the meeting of Parliament.

The temporary tranquillity which prevailed in Ireland after the enactment of the Coercion Act, was immediately attributed by its authors and advocates to its operation; but this was a mistake on the part of some, and a wilful misrepresentation on the part of others; the truth is, there were, at the time when its enactment was determined on by the Government, two distinct systems of agitation in

active operation in Ireland: that which had been formed and was conducted by Mr. O'Connell in person, and carefully kept by him within the limits of the law; and that which resulted from the strong disinclination of the people to pay tithes, and the oppressive manner in which their payment was exacted by or under the direction of those who were anxious to have fulfilled their predictions that tranquillity would not follow the removal of the political disability of the Roman Catholics. To the efforts of these persons were added the exertions of the irresponsible agents of Government, or such of its members as were anxious to draw off the attention of the people from the repeal agitation, and such of those also as were sincerely desirous of applying so much only of the revenues of the Established Church to the support of its ministers, as was necessary to give them a respectable maintenance, having regard to the very limited amount of their congregations, but without interfering with vested rights. Now, so far was Mr. O'Connell from being displeased at the tithe agitation being suppressed, he secretly rejoiced at it, for the violations of the law to which it gave rise were most unjustly attributed by his political adversaries to his agitation of the repeal of the Union. The injustice, however, of this imputation was apparent from the fact that, so soon as the tithe agitation and its consequential outrages

ceased, his agitation revived and became as vigorous as ever, and although unattended with outrage or even a disturbance of the public peace, proved much more embarrassing to his political adversaries, whether they were of the Whig or Tory party, than the tithe agitation. To discover his policy was not a matter of difficulty to any person of ordinary penetration, who conversed with him in private, and coincided with him as to the policy which ought to be pursued by the Government towards Ireland, but expressed their reasons for refusing to co-operate with him in his agitation; for, when pressed in argument, he often terminated the conversation by declaring that if the leaders of the popular party in Ireland did not seek the repeal of the Union they would lose the political co-operation of the people, and gain nothing from the British Government. He was fully aware of the notion long entertained by Lord Melbourne and many of the leading Whigs that Ireland could be governed only through the Conservative party in that country; but such was not the opinion of the Marquis of Wellesley, or Lord Plunket, or of Lord Anglesea, when he had the benefit of official experience, and saw clearly that the greater number of the leaders of the Conservative party looked only to their own aggrandisement, and CARED LITTLE FOR THE PROSPERITY OF THE COUNTRY AT LARGE.

Scarcely had "The Coercion Act," and the "Church Temporalities Act," received the royal assent, than Mr. Stanley was removed from the office of Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to that of Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order to discharge a duty very different indeed from that which he discharged with respect to Ireland, and in the month of September following the Marquis of Anglesea was removed from the office of Lord-Lieutenant, not, however, to be placed in any other office, treatment which inflicted a deep wound upon his pride, and which he attributed to a desire on the part of Government to conciliate Mr. O'Connell. Such, however, was not the fact. To administer the Government of Ireland at the time, required all the skill and experience of a statesman of no ordinary abilities, and the choice fell upon the Marquis of Wellesley, who had discharged the duties of the office of Lord-Lieutenant from the month of December, 1821, to the month of March, 1828; but his re-appointment was one of the many mistakes committed by Lord Grey, for, beyond strongly recommending a change in the mode of distributing the official patronage of Ireland, and refraining from exciting popular discontent by active measures, he did nothing to promote a change for the better in the condition of the country. His lordship was, like many of his order, a compound of no inconsiderable abilities as a statesman, highly cultivated literary taste,

and most inordinate vanity. The first two were rendered useless by his indolence, but the last retained its pristine vigour to the close of his official career.

THE ORANGE LOYALISTS TRY TO PREVENT VICTORIA COMING TO THE THRONE.

“In the month of August” [1835], “and just as the session of Parliament was about to close, and the public mind little disposed to indulge in further excitement, its attention was called by the newspapers to some transactions that had been recently brought to light by a committee of the House of Commons, and which would, at an earlier period of our history, have led to very serious results, and closed ignominiously the earthly career of some persons whose rank in society would not then have secured to them the impunity it did in the year 1835.

“We have already stated that when Sir Robert Peel took upon himself the executive government of the empire, an Irish section of the Conservatives, known as the Orange party, and more remarkable for its violence than its political strength or public utility, evinced a strong desire to attract public attention by its zeal to sustain his Government. The members of it, however, so conducted themselves during the short time he remained in office as to become more

formidable to him than to his adversaries. He, who had spent so much of his early life in Ireland, well knew that the active leaders of the party in that country were influenced mainly by a desire to found a claim upon his Government for the enjoyment of the official patronage of which their predecessors had for many years enjoyed almost a monopoly. He could not, however, cast them off without giving offence to many of his party who were not Orangemen, or aware of the very high price at which the Orangemen of Ireland valued their political support; but some of the Irish section of the Opposition were fully informed of the proceedings of their old antagonists, and of the feelings with which Sir Robert Peel regarded them. In the month of February, 1835, and while he was struggling with the many difficulties with which he had to contend, several of the Orange lodges presented addresses to his Majesty through Mr. Goulburn, the Secretary for the Home Department, who, being rather disposed to favour them, caused what are termed in official parlance 'gracious answers' to be returned to them. Upon a motion being made in the House of Commons for the production of the addresses and answers, a debate arose, during which Sir Robert Peel evinced a strong desire to avert the storm he foresaw would result from the indiscreet conduct of his very unwelcome allies; his

speech was, therefore, apologetical, and anything but defensive. Encouraged by the disinclination which was evinced on all hands to defend the recent public conduct in Ireland of the Orange Societies, Mr. Finn, an Irish member, moved, on the 23rd of March, for a select committee to inquire into the nature, character, extent, and tendency of Orange lodges, associations, or societies in Ireland, and to report their opinion thereon to the House. As this motion was not opposed, the committee was appointed, and proceeded with the inquiries. During their progress it became manifest that however innocent the vast majority of the members of the Orange Societies unquestionably were of any participation in certain designs of some of their active leaders, these designs were of a highly criminal character. It appeared that there were 1,500 Orange lodges in Ireland, consisting of members varying in number from 16 to 260, and a great number in England and Scotland in communication and correspondence with each other, and having secret signs and pass-words, as bonds of union, and all depending on the Grand Lodge of Ireland—that the members were exclusively Protestant; in other words, that all persons not being Roman Catholics were admissible, the ostensible objects of the institution being to prevent the accession to the throne of any sovereign professing the

Roman Catholic religion, and to uphold what was termed Protestant ascendancy in the State; that every member should be admitted under the form of a religious sanction, and a religious ceremony; that no lodge could be constituted without a warrant of the Grand Lodge of Ireland, signed by the Grand Master and office bearers for the time being, and having the seal of the Grand Lodge affixed thereto. That such warrants had been issued to non-commissioned officers and privates of several regiments of cavalry and infantry, serving at home and abroad, to non-commissioned officers of the staff of several militia regiments, to members of the military corps and police; that such warrants were sent privately and indirectly to such non-commissioned officers and privates, without the knowledge or sanction of their commanding officers, and in contravention of general orders of the commander of the forces; and that his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, in his capacity of Grand Master of the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland, had, so recently as the then last preceding month of April, signed warrants which had been issued for constituting Orange lodges in the army. Now, had no further disclosures been made, there would not have been much to attract public attention, but it appeared that not long before the death of George IV., some of the most active leaders of the Orange lodges in England, and amongst

them men of no inferior position in society, entertained a design to place the Duke of Cumberland on the throne, or instal him in the office of Regent, on the demise of the King TO THE EXCLUSION OF the then Duke of Clarence and THE PRINCESS VICTORIA, INTENDING TO ASSIGN AS REASONS FOR SUCH CONDUCT THE ALLEGED INSANITY OF THE FORMER, AND THE SEX AND MINORITY OF THE LATTER. It also further appeared that some such criminal design was seriously contemplated in the event of the Duke of Cumberland surviving his then Majesty.

“On the 4th of August, and while the inquiry was still proceeding before the committee, Mr. Hume brought the subject before the House, and moved several resolutions stating the result of the evidence so far as it related to the number of lodges, and the issuing of warrant, signed by the Duke of Cumberland to organise lodges in the army, and proposing that an address should be presented to his Majesty, praying that he would be pleased to direct his attention to the nature and extent of Orange lodges in the army, and to the circumstance of the Duke of Cumberland, a Field-Marshal, having signed warrants for the purpose of establishing them. The adoption of these resolutions was resisted on a ground of form, as not being expressive of any opinion on the part of the House. The debate was, however, adjourned for some days at the instance of

Lord John Russell, manifestly for the purpose of affording his Royal Highness an opportunity of disclaiming or explaining the conduct imputed to him, but his Royal Highness did nothing more in the interval than deny all knowledge of the issuing of military warrants, alleging, what no one could, under the circumstances disclosed, believe, that he had signed warrants in blank without knowing the use to which it was intended to apply them.

“When the debate was resumed, Lord John Russell expressed his regret that his Royal Highness had not thought proper to break off all communication with the parties who had been guilty of such unwarrantable acts. The result, however, was that several of the resolutions were adopted and some withdrawn. The committee subsequently made its report, but the Government was too feeble to bring so powerful a criminal as his Royal Highness to justice.”¹

THE ORIGIN OF THE REPEALERS.—1830.

In Ireland the same parties [Tory, Whig, and Radical] nominally existed; but the peculiar state of that country had for many

¹ Vide *Annual Register*, 1835, page 329. Should the reader be desirous of further information respecting the facts brought to light by the inquiry he can acquire it by reference to Martineau's *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii. pp. 266 to 278, and the several authorities therein referred to.

years divided its people into what were termed the Protestant and Catholic parties. These were respectively composed of those persons who had strongly opposed, or successfully struggled for, the abolition of the civil disabilities under which the Roman Catholics of the empire had long laboured. THERE WAS THEN ALSO COMING INTO EXISTENCE A PARTY, WHICH SOON BECAME THE MOST PROMINENT OF ALL, and was composed of a vast number of persons who conscientiously believed, and some who affected to believe, that a repeal of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland was essentially necessary for the promotion of the prosperity of the latter. The Irish Protestants had been long divided into the many who had opposed, and the comparatively few who had not opposed, the repeal of the penal laws. To the former was, for the reasons we shall presently state, given the designation of Tories, and to the latter, owing to their professing the principles of civil and religious liberty, was given that of Whigs, although many of them had not any confidence in the leaders of that party. Of the Roman Catholics, a vast majority soon joined what was termed the Repealers, and many of the minority forgetting for a time the origin of the penal laws, and the unrelenting severity with which the Whig party had during a long official career enforced their execution, and giving the modern members of

it credit for sincerity in their professions of a regard for the principles of civil and religious liberty, exerted their influence, such as it was, to sustain the Whigs in their struggle for power.

CATHOLIC ASCENDENCY.—1835.

But they were afraid of establishing Catholic ascendancy. The Catholics had been in power three times since the Reformation, and they never persecuted the Protestants. In the reign of Mary what did they do? Did they persecute? Harris, a writer by no means favourable to the Catholics, had borne a reluctant testimony to the conduct of the Irish Catholics, fresh as they were from persecution. When the Protestants were cruelly persecuted at Bristol, the corporation of Dublin opened seventy houses for the accommodation of the Protestant families flying from Bristol, protected them from the Queen, and kept them free of expense for a year and a half. THERE NEVER WAS A TIME SO FAVOURABLE FOR PROPITIATING IRELAND AS THE PRESENT. The Protestants should not be the slaves of Catholics, neither should they be their masters. All that the Catholics required was equal, even-handed justice.

GREATER BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES
SEND RESOLUTIONS AND CONGRATULATIONS.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

*In the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred
and Eighty-six.*

RESOLUTIONS

Relative to Home Rule in Ireland.

Resolved, That the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts do hereby tender the Irish people their sympathy in the struggle they are now making for home rule in Ireland.

Resolved, That they view with admiration and respect the noble stand taken by England's illustrious statesman, WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE, in defence of popular government for the people and by the people.

Resolved, That we tender our congratulations to the English people on the fact of their having a government possessing the courage to make an effort to do justice to the wronged and suffering people of Ireland.

SENATE, *April 14, 1886.*

Adopted—sent down for concurrence.

S. N. GIFFORD, *Clerk.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *April 22, 1886.*

Adopted in concurrence,

EDWARD A. McLAUGHLIN, *Clerk.*

SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT,

BOSTON, *April 26, 1886.*

A true Copy.

Witness the Seal of the Commonwealth.

HENRY B. PEIRCE, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS

*Passed at a Public Meeting
of the Citizens of Montreal, Canada, on the
15th April, 1886.*

His Worship the MAYOR presiding.

Whereas, The right of Self-Government is the common and indisputable heritage of all people, and its enjoyment is the basis and safeguard of a nation's peace, union, and prosperity :—

Whereas, The Canadian people, knowing from actual experience the great benefits to be derived from constitutional and free Government, by the people for the people, desire to see the same constitutional system of Government extended to the Irish people :—

Resolved, That we, citizens of Montreal, assembled in public meeting, on this 15th day of April, 1886, warmly sympathize with the Irish people in their demands and struggles for the right of Self-Government, and we congratulate them on the prospect of an early and successful termination of their long and patriotic struggle.

Resolved, That we sincerely congratulate the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, premier of Great Britain, on his wise statesmanship in introducing a home rule bill for the national government of Ireland, thereby recognizing the justice of the claim for a free and independent parliament in that country, and we hope that the first adviser of Her Majesty will be able to carry to a successful issue a project which will unquestionably confer great benefit upon Ireland, and afford relief and comfort to the Empire.

Resolved, That we also extend our heartiest congratulations to Mr. CHARLES STEWART PARNELL, and to his Parliamentary colleagues, on the success which is daily attending, in so full a measure, their great labors and sacrifices for the freedom of Ireland.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. PARNELL.

H. BEAUGRAND, Mayor, *Chairman*.

D. BARRY, *Secretary*.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE W. E. GLADSTONE,
Premier of England,
London.

CHICAGO, *April 30th*, 1886.

HON. WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE,
Premier of England.

DEAR SIR,

The following is a true copy of proceedings of City Council held April 26th, 1886.

Whereas, Chicago has been among the first of American Cities to send words of cheer with material aid to the Irish people in their heroic struggle for home rule and land reform.

Resolved, That the Mayor and City Council of Chicago view with pleasure the comprehensive and equitable scheme for Irish local self government which has been submitted to the British parliament by the Right Hon. WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE, and which after judicious amendment, if enacted, will prove a measure of lasting reconciliation and friendship between the two people.

Resolved, That we trust the patriotic efforts of England's great statesmen to do justice to Ireland and enable her sorely oppressed people to live and thrive shall be crowned with success.

Resolved, That we congratulate Mr. CHAS. S. PARNELL and his compatriots on the wonderful progress that has attended their constitutional efforts to emancipate Ireland from penury, misrule and despair.

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread on the records of this Council, and that the Mayor and City Clerk are instructed to transmit by cable copies thereof to Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. PARNELL.

CHARLES H. HARRISON, *Mayor*.

Attest.

C. HERMAN PLANTZ, *City Clerk*.

MALTA, *May 7th*, 1886.

To RIGHT HONORABLE W. E. GLADSTONE,
London.

Nandi, Roncali, Barbaro, Aguis, Muscat, Mizzi, elected members of council of Govt., charge me with the enviable task of expressing to you, Sir, our admiration at the high sentiments of justice and true liberty which induced you to propose in Parliament a bill granting autonomy to Ireland, and

heartily to congratulate you, wishing happy result to the generous proposal, which, when realized, will greatly honor the Empire, and justify the fame which marks out the British flag as the protector of liberty and right.

VINCENZO BUGEJA, C.M.G.,

Leader of Elected Bench.

List of Public Meetings in America and the Colonies on the Irish Question, from which telegrams have been sent to Mr. Gladstone.

Boston.	The Mayor presiding.
St. Paul's.	The Governor of Minnesota presiding.
Montreal.	The Mayor presiding.
Pittsburg.	" "
Nashville.	The Governor of Tennessee presiding.
Minneapolis.	The Mayor presiding.
Newark, New Jersey.	The Mayor presiding.
Longbranch.	
Jersey City.	
Indianapolis.	
St. Louis.	A Judge of Appeal presiding.
New Orleans.	Governor of Louisiana presiding.
Lincoln.	Governor of Nebraska presiding.
Auckland, New Zealand.	

Wilmington, U.S.A.

Watertown, Mass.

Binghamton, New York.

Buffalo, U.S.A.

Brooklyn (2). Mayor presiding.

Bloomington, Illinois.

Roxbury, Mass.

Norwood, „

Portland, U.S.A.

Warrnambool, Victoria.

Cootanumbra, N.S.W.

WARRNAMBOOL, *May 7th*, 1886.

To GLADSTONE, *London*.

Warrnambool Australians and Colonists, without distinction of nationality or religion, in public meeting assembled, honor the courage and patriotism which has prompted your Home Rule proposals. They believe them to contain the essence of the only means calculated to preserve the integrity of the Empire upon a basis of affection for the throne, and pray that you may be spared to pass such a measure, which will be the crowning glory of your political life.

JOHN MURRAY, M.P., *Chairman*.

To PREMIER GLADSTONE, *House of Commons.*

HALIFAX, N.S., *May 10th, 1886.*

House of Assembly of Nova Scotia has unanimously recorded its sympathy with you in your efforts to give Ireland local self-government.

W. S. FIELDING,
Premier and Prov. Secretary.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

QUEBEC, *Friday, April 16th, 1886.*

Mr. CARBRAY moved, seconded by Mr. McSHANE, that

Whereas the right of self-government is sacred to the Canadian people, and whereas they believe and know, from actual experience, that constitutional Government brings strength, peace, union and prosperity to the nation :

Be it Resolved,

That this House, always sensible to everything tending to the greater welfare, progress, and happiness of every section of the Empire, desires to record its warm appreciation and great pleasure on the initiation in the Imperial Parliament, of legislation of a character to give a local government to Ireland.

Resolved, That this House regards with great satisfaction and sympathy the noble efforts of the Right Honorable W. E. GLADSTONE to peacefully solve the problem of Home Rule in Ireland without disintegrating the Empire.

Resolved, That the Speaker of this House be directed to communicate a copy of these resolutions to the Right Honorable W. E. GLADSTONE.

To Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE.

QUEBEC, *May 9th*, 1886.

City Council at first meeting here unanimously adopted following resolution: That this newly elected Council of the ancient capital of Canada deems the present an

opportune time to express its unswerving faith in the principles of self-government, deprived of which the people of Canada would neither be content nor loyal; and further it desires to join, as it now heartily does, in the general homage being rendered to the illustrious statesman at the head of Her Majesty's Government in England and his noble colleagues for the evidence they have given of a firm resolve to place within the reach of the people of Ireland all the advantages of autonomic government. That this Corporation recognizes in the present action of England's great minister the policy best calculated to preserve British power, and secure the early triumph in Ireland of justice over wrong, and it fervently invokes Heaven to vouchsafe to him health and length of days to enjoy the happiness of witnessing the success of his intrepid efforts for the freedom of millions, followed by all the contentment, prosperity, and unity amongst the people of Great Britain and Ireland which his great heart and patriot soul so ardently long for.

Carried.

F. LANGEIER, *Mayor.*

*To the Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE,
London.*

MONTREAL, *May 6th*, 1886.

The following resolutions have been adopted at a meeting of the municipal council of Montreal, Monday, 3rd May, 1886 : That, whereas the right of self-government is sacred to the Canadian people, and whereas they believe and know from actual experience that constitutional government brings strength, peace, union, and prosperity to a nation, be it resolved that this council regards with great satisfaction and sympathy the noble efforts of the Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE to peacefully solve the problem of home rule in Ireland, without disintegrating the Empire. Resolved that his worship the mayor be directed to communicate by telegraph a copy of these resolutions to the Prime Minister of England.

H. BEAUGRAND, *Mayor*,

DR. WEINMANN AND HENRY BLAU.

WHAT does Ireland demand? That which every one demands and will have in his own household, the ruling of his own surroundings. Admit this principle as applicable to the management of the family, and it cannot be evaded as also applicable to the aggregate composing the state.

As against the institution of a parliament in Dublin it is argued that the establishment of any Irish Parliament in that city would jeopardise the unity of the Empire. If it can be shown that separate state or local parliaments can exist under parallel circumstances by the side of an Imperial Parliament, without danger to minorities or the integrity and unity of the Empire, the fallacy of the argument is at once apparent.

We will therefore pass in review some of the states which have, by decentralizing administration, consolidated their Imperial supremacy, and proved conclusively the case for Home Rule.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

No country affords a better example of the beneficial influence of local Government than Austria-Hungary. Austria is divided into seventeen different provinces — Bohemia, Dalmatia, Galicia, Upper Austria, Lower

Austria, Salzburg, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Bukowina, Moravia, Silesia, Tyrol, Vorarlberg, Goritz and Gradiska, Istria, the free town of Trieste, and the Kingdom of Hungary. The connecting tie between them all consists of the person of the hereditary Sovereign, a common army and navy, and a body called the delegations forming the Imperial Parliament. German-Austria returns sixty members, the other half is elected by Hungary. These delegations sit in two chambers, and meet every year in Vienna and Buda-Pesth alternately.

The delegations decide all questions and have absolute control over departments of finance, commerce, and industry, all ecclesiastical affairs, religion, education, justice, post and telegraph service, railways, weights, measures, territorial army and the raising of recruits.

The local parliaments, of which each Austrian state possesses one, consist of one chamber, in which archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic and Oriental Greek churches, chancellors and rectors of universities, the representatives of great estates, of towns, chambers of commerce and manufactures, and rural communes, sit for a term of six years, the former by virtue of their office, the latter by vote of duly but variously qualified electors.

These separate diets, as they are called, are respectively authorised to make laws concerning local administration, especially those affecting local taxation, cultivation of the soil,

educational, church, and charitable institutions, and public works executed at public expense.

With regard to Croatia and Slavonia, these have a Land-Tag, or diet, of their own, and a separate minister presiding over his department in connection with the Hungarian Parliament; but with regard to their internal affairs, religion, public instruction, and justice, they are entirely autonomous. The Banus, or president, exercises only civil authority, and is appointed by the Emperor.

Students of history will not forget the aspect of affairs in Hungary in the years 1848-9, when Kossuth moved the dethronement of the Hapsburg-Lothringen family, and although the battle of Vilagos crushed the rebellion, the volcano of discontent smouldered on until 1867, when Hungary found her opportunity in Austria's misfortunes; and Baron Beust, then the minister of a petty state, discovered the remedy to regenerate an empire on the verge of dissolution by granting not only independence to Hungary, but also constitutional freedom to the western half of the state, whereby the consolidation of the Empire was firmly cemented.

The following sentences from the *Times* (Annual Summary, 1867) now strenuously opposing Home Rule for Ireland, will be regarded as a curiosity:—

“In the course of a single year the grant of independence to Hungary and of constitu-

tional freedom to the western half of the Monarchy has removed nearly all the discontent which had paralysed the strength of the Empire. Russian intrigues among some of the Slavonic tribes produced the same kind of annoyance which is caused in England by the American encouragement of the Fenian agitation ; but the Bohemians are not likely to carry their jealousy of their German countrymen so far as to transfer their allegiance to a Russian despot. Baron Beust had scarcely replaced Count Belcredi as Prime Minister when the Emperor conceded the demands which had long been preferred in vain by his Hungarian subjects. A separate and responsible Ministry for Hungary was constituted under the Presidency of Count Andrassy ; and in the month of June, Francis Joseph, after a provisional reign of eighteen years, was crowned at Pesth, having at last complied with the indispensable condition of swearing to maintain the ancient constitution of the kingdom. The ceremony was performed with mediæval splendour, in the midst of an enthusiasm scarcely to be found among more sophisticated nations. The difficulty of governing two free and reciprocally independent countries will try the sagacity of Austrian and Hungarian statesmen ; but the alternative experiment of creating a *factitious and illegal unity* had already been found *hopeless and disastrous.*"

GERMANY.

In the case of Germany there exists in that country, simultaneously with the central parliament, or Reichstag, a number of separate parliaments without danger to imperial unity. In home affairs each state acts independently—vice the Emperor William's message to the Reichstag denying the right of that body to inquire into the expulsion of Poles from Prussian provinces, an act instigated by the Prussian ministry, and authorised by himself as King of Prussia. In the case of Alsace-Lorraine, a limited amount of local authority is granted under the imperial laws of May 2nd, 1877, and July 4th, 1879. The Emperor exercises, in accordance with these laws, the authority belonging to a sovereign of other German countries, which authority is handed over to a deputy-governor in Strasburg. All laws for this territory emanate from the Emperor, with the sanction of the Imperial Bundesrath, but they must also be sanctioned by a local committee of fifty-eight members.

ICELAND.

Iceland, although a Danish possession, has a local government of its own. The King of Denmark appoints the governor and a sixth of the members composing the Althing, the people electing the remainder. No constitutional difficulties have ever arisen.

FINLAND.

Autocratic Russia recognising the necessity of granting free administration in local affairs, Finland has preserved its ancient constitution, and has a national parliament of four estates. It is, however, but right to mention that Finland is practically governed by the governor-general and a senate appointed by the Emperor of Russia.

CANADA.

Under the Act of Confederation of 1867 the executive is invested in the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland, and carried out by a governor-general appointed by the Crown and Privy Council. Legislative authority rests with a central parliament sitting at Ottawa, consisting of two houses—the Senate and the House of Commons. The former has 78 members, chosen by the governor-general. They must be born or naturalized subjects, over thirty years of age, and must own property of not less than 4,000 dollars in their respective provinces. Ontario sends 24, Quebec 24, Nova Scotia, 10, New Brunswick 10, Manitoba 3, British Columbia 3, Prince Edward Island 4. The House of Commons has a member for every 17,000 of the population, and is elected for five years.

Each province has in addition a lieutenant-governor, chosen by the governor-general in council, and is assisted by a local executive of two chambers, the legislative council of which members are appointed for life, and the legislative assembly, members of which are elected by the people for four years.

From the foregoing it will appear that no danger has ever accrued by the institution of petty parliaments under the suzerainty of imperial councils. What is more remarkable, almost in every case where the foreign ruler caused irritation, the formation of a national parliament tended to create law and order. What the condition of Austria and Hungary would now be had Count Beust refrained from giving remedial legislation is difficult to say, but this is certain: not only England but Austria would have an Ireland on her threshold.

That the Government of Ireland Bill should have been defeated in the House of Commons is very deplorable, for Mr. Gladstone's Bill is, in spite of all the objections lodged against it, after all a very moderate measure; so moderate, indeed, that if Austria had in 1867 proposed to Hungary a bill betraying so many doubts in the honesty and good faith of the Hungarians, it would never have been accepted by the latter. Mr. Gladstone's Bill is a chain of safeguards, denoting the great experience of a statesman whose heart and

mind is bent upon being just to all parties. It provides a state of autonomy subservient to the British crown, it establishes a kind of government under government, a sort of enfranchised liberty (liberty on parole). It duly considers the rights of minorities, taking great care not to provide the Irish with a weapon which they could turn against their present rulers. Such a bill means the achievement of an end; it means a practical conclusion of long years' feud.

Can any finality be found in Mr. Chamberlain's federation scheme? A simple scheme of federation does not go far enough, as the essential point in Irish legislation is the removal of political wrongs which have worked mischief for centuries. This point consists in the entire removal of the system which caused the irritation, and such a problem can be hardly solved by a simple state of federation. The federation of the German empire, the federation of the Italian states, the proposed federation of the colonies, are quite distinct cases, and non-analogous to the federation as desired by Mr. Chamberlain. In the Italian and German case the federation meant the union of several states, but only one nation. The Prussians, Bavarians, and Saxons are all Germans. The people of Sardinia, Umbria, and Tuscany, all Italians; and even in the federation of the North American States it may be safely argued that there was

only one nation to be dealt with. But in the case of Ireland two distinct races have to be considered. It is individualism which utters its vote against simple federation. Mr. Chamberlain then requires the retention of the Irish members on the principle of no taxation without representation. The exclusion of the Irish party from St. Stephen's, as Mr. Gladstone wills it, is decidedly the most preferable. It stands to reason that if the English parliament shall not legislate for Ireland, the Irish ought not to have this advantage. There is, in fact, not the slightest necessity for the presence of the Irish in Westminster, as in case any taxation difficulty arises, the same could be settled as follows: The matter is discussed in Dublin and London; the votes are taken at the same time and transmitted in a sealed box to Westminster, where they are counted with the Ayes and Noes respectively; it being understood that in any emergency of that kind an English commissioner be sent to Dublin to explain the English Government's position on the particular question. Said commissioner to have a voice, but no vote.

Mr. Goschen is another of the many opponents of the Government of Ireland Bill, and well might he have commenced his discourse, "Distrust is the subject of my story." He has no confidence in the honesty of the Irish nation, and believes that the institution of a Home Rule Parliament would ultimately lead

to separation. Has it led to separation in the Hungarian case? No, on the contrary, it has cemented the friendship between two people entirely alien in blood and customs, more than anything else could have done.

He then avails himself, as all weak opponents do, of the religious argument, and quotes the position of the Bohemian Protestants as an example of what would happen in Ulster. It is fallacy on Mr. Goschen's part to colour the position as he has done. The Protestant in Catholic Bohemia is just as safe as he is at present in Catholic Ireland. Mr. Goschen cannot produce one case to show that the Bohemian Protestant lives under exceptional legislation, or is allowed to suffer on account of his religious denomination. It is simply ridiculous to mention an occasional case, and build a theory upon it. In a state like Austria and Hungary, which contains an enormous number of all kinds of religious sects and denominations, there is of course occasional friction caused by individuals, but they are by no means so frequent as the Orange and Nationalist encounters which are not a little nurtured by the Irish-Protestant clergy.

Injudicious words such as those uttered by Mr. Goschen when he said, "It was said that the passage of the Bill was to be a message of love to Ireland, but the paper on which that message of love was written was to be torn up

immediately, before the ink was dry"—are doing great harm, because they kindle the fire, and suffocate almost every feeling of reconciliation that may exist.

Machiavelli in his *Principe*, explaining how cities and principalities who lived under their own laws before they were subdued, are to be governed, says, "Permit them to enjoy their old privileges and laws, found a kind of council of state, and keep the people in amity and obedience. And that council being set up by you, and knowing that it subsists only by your favour and authority, will not omit anything that may propagate and enlarge them;" and this is corroborated by Oliver Cromwell, when he wrote these remarkable words: "It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousy to deprive a man of his natural liberty on the supposition that he may abuse it. When he does abuse it, judge."

Never at any critical period has the rising of a political difficulty on the European horizon caused the eyes of Europe and the world to look with greater anxiety upon its approaching meridian than the one now being universally discussed.

Two gigantic forces stand opposed to each other—one with all the panoply of might and power, the other weaker, but armed by the justice of its cause. The fray is keenly watched on all sides. Is England, who has always been the pioneer of liberty to

oppressed nationalities, now to swerve from the straight road of justice by not acknowledging the clamour at her own door? or will she take up the position of the proverbial finger-post which points the way to erring travellers, but never advances itself. The problem to be solved, though in itself one of local importance, has in its final solution a world-wide application. The onward march of mankind, with England in the van, stands still to await the result of this momentous duel. Schlegel, in his *Philosophy of History*, commenting on mankind's advance towards that civilisation which is the happiness of the greatest number, has remarked on the ebb and flow which regulate the tide of human progress. Will that country whose proudest boast has been her position as the vanguard of the world's liberties now drop the standard which she has carried so long, place a stumbling-block in the road which she has cleared with her own sword for the advance of nations, and turn the tide of human progress now approaching the flood?